arXiv:1003.2305v1 [math.AP] 11 Mar 2010

On the A-Obstacle Problem and the Hausdorff Measure of its Free Boundary

S. Challal[1], A. Lyaghfouri[1] and J. F. Rodrigues[2]

[1] Fields Institute, 222 College Street
Toronto M5T 3J1, Canada

[2] University of Lisbon/CMAF
Av. Prof. Gama Pinto, 2
1649-003 Lisboa, Portugal

Abstract

In this paper we prove existence and uniqueness of an entropy solution to the A-obstacle problem, for L^1-data. We also extend the Lewy-Stampacchia inequalities to the general framework of L^1-data, and show convergence and stability results. We then prove that the free boundary has finite $(N-1)$-Hausdorff measure, which completes previous works on this subject by Caffarelli for the Laplace operator and by Lee and Shahgholian for the $p-$Laplace operator when $p > 2$.

MSC: 35R35, 35B05, 35J60

Key words : Obstacle problem, Entropy Solution, A-Laplace operator, Lewy-Stampacchia Inequalities, Stability, Free boundary, Hausdorff measure.

1 Introduction

We consider the obstacle problem in a bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^N$ $(N \geqslant 2)$, associated with data $f \in L^1(\Omega)$, an admissible obstacle ψ and boundary data g in $W^{1,A}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_A u = f & \text{in} \quad \{u > \psi\}, \\ u \geqslant \psi \quad \text{in} & \Omega, \\ u = g \quad \text{on} & \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where the $A-$Laplace operator

$$\Delta_A u = div\Big(\frac{a(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|}\nabla u\Big) = div(\nabla_A u), \tag{1.2}$$

is associated with a C^1 function $a\ :[0,+\infty)\to[0,+\infty)$, $a(0)=0$ and with $A(t)=\displaystyle\int_0^t a(s)ds$ the $N-$function of the Orlicz-Sobolev space $W^{1,A}(\Omega)=\{u\in L^A(\Omega):\ \nabla u\in L^A(\Omega)\}$, which is the usual subspace of $W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ associated with the norm $\|u\|_{W^{1,A}(\Omega)}=\|u\|_A+\|\nabla u\|_A$, and where $L^A(\Omega)$ is the Orlicz space equipped with the respective Luxembourg norm (see [1]).
The obstacle problem (1.1), as it is well known (see, for instance, [18]), may be formulated as a minimization problem of the functional

$$J(v)=\int_\Omega A(|\nabla v|)dx+\int_\Omega fvdx, \tag{1.3}$$

for a given $f\in L^\infty(\Omega)$, in the convex set

$$K_{\psi,g}=\{v\in W^{1,A}(\Omega),\quad v-g\in W_0^{1,A}(\Omega),\quad v\geqslant\psi\quad \text{a.e. in }\Omega\}, \tag{1.4}$$

provided $K_{\psi,g}\neq\emptyset$, which holds if $(\psi-g)^+\in W_0^{1,A}(\Omega)$, for instance, and where $W_0^{1,A}(\Omega)$ is the closure of $\mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ in $W^{1,A}(\Omega)$.

In this work we intend to extend several known global and local properties of the solution of the obstacle problem and of its free boundary $(\partial\{u>\psi\})\cap\Omega$ to a large class of degenerate and singular elliptic operators under the natural condition which generalizes the Ladyzhenskaya-Uraltseva operators, for some constants a_0 and a_1

$$0<a_0\leqslant\frac{ta'(t)}{a(t)}\leqslant a_1\qquad\forall t>0,\qquad a_0,a_1\text{ are positive constants.} \tag{1.5}$$

This not only includes the case of the $p-$Laplacian Δ_p (when $a_0=a_1=p-1>0$), but also the interesting case of a variable exponent $p=p(t)>0$

$$\Delta_A u = div\big(|\nabla u|^{p(|\nabla u|)-2}\nabla u\big), \tag{1.6}$$

corresponding to set $a(t)=t^{p(t)-1}$, for which (1.5) holds if $a_0\leqslant t\ln(t)p'(t)+p(t)-1\leqslant a_1$, for all $t>0$.
Other examples of functions satisfying (1.5) are given by $a(t)=t^\alpha\ln(\beta t+\gamma)$, with $\alpha,\beta,\gamma>0$, or by discontinuous power transitions like $a(t)=c_1t^\alpha$, if $0\leq t<t_0$, and $a(t)=c_2t^\beta+c_3$, if $t\geqslant t_0$, where α,β,t_0, are positive numbers, and c_1, c_2 and c_3 are real numbers such that $a(t)$ is a C^1 function (take $a_0=\min(\alpha,\beta)$ and $a_1=\max(\alpha,\beta)$). Since linear combinations with positive constants, products and compositions of C^1 functions satisfying (1.5) also satisfy a similar condition, with different positive constants a_0 and a_1, we conclude that there exists a large class of $N-$functions A that are included in this work. Without loss of generality, we will assume that $a_0\leqslant 1\leqslant a_1$.

As it is well known, minimizing (1.3) in (1.4) is equivalent to solving the following variational inequality

$$u \in K_{g,\psi} \ : \quad \int_\Omega \nabla_A u . \nabla(v-u)dx + \int_\Omega f(v-u)dx \geqslant 0, \quad \forall v \in K_{\psi,g}, \tag{1.7}$$

where we used the notation $\nabla_A u = \dfrac{a(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|}\nabla u$, for the $A-$gradient associated with the Δ_A introduced in (1.2).

Since the assumption (1.5) implies that $-\Delta_A$ is a coercive and strictly monotone operator in $W^{1,A}(\Omega)$ (see [13] or [9]), which is a reflexive and separable Banach space (see [1]), the existence and uniqueness of a variational solution to (1.7) follows easily. In fact, since (1.5) also implies the inequality (2.4), which in turn leads to the continuous embedding $L^A(\Omega) \subset L^{a_0+1}(\Omega)$, we have $W^{1,A}(\Omega) \subset W^{1,a_0+1}(\Omega)$. Therefore by Sobolev embedding, we have

$$W^{1,A}(\Omega) \subset L^q(\Omega) \tag{1.8}$$

for $q = N(a_0+1)/(N-(a_0+1))$ if $1+a_0 < N$, for any $q < \infty$ if $a_0+1 = N$, and for $q = \infty$ if $a_0+1 > N$. Hence, in this later case, we may still solve (1.7) in $W^{1,A}(\Omega)$ with f only in $L^1(\Omega)$, and with $f \in L^r(\Omega)$ for $r > 1$ if $a_0+1 = N$, or any $r \geq q' = N(1+a_0)/(Na_0+a_0+1)$ if $a_0+1 < N$.
However if $a_0+1 < N$, for a general $f \in L^1(\Omega)$, the second integral in (1.7) is not defined, and following [4] and [6], we are led to the more general definition of a solution to the obstacle problem, using the truncation function

$$T_s(r) = \max(-s, \min(s,r)), \quad r \in \mathbb{R} :$$

An *entropy solution* of the obstacle problem (1.1) is a measurable function u such that $u \geqslant \psi$ a.e. in Ω, and, for every $s > 0$, $T_s(u) - T_s(g) \in W_0^{1,A}(\Omega)$ and

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_A u . \nabla(T_s(v-u))dx + \int_\Omega f T_s(v-u)dx \geqslant 0, \qquad \forall v \in K_{\psi,g}. \tag{1.9}$$

We observe that no global integrability condition is required on u nor on its gradient, but as it was shown in [4] for Sobolev spaces, if $T_s(u) \in W^{1,A}(\Omega)$ for all $s > 0$, then there exists a unique measurable vector field $U : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $\nabla(T_s(u)) = \chi_{\{|u|<s\}} U$ a.e. in Ω, $s > 0$, which, in fact, coincides with the standard distributional gradient of ∇u whenever $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$.

Our first results concern global properties of entropy solutions in the $L^1(\Omega)$-framework. Without loss of generality we can assume that $a_0 < N - 1$.

Theorem 1.1. *For given $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $\psi, g \in W^{1,A}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $K_{\psi,g} \neq \emptyset$, there exists a unique entropy solution u to (1.9), which moreover satisfies*

$$u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega), \qquad \textit{for all } p,\ 1 < p < \frac{N}{N-1} a_0. \tag{1.10}$$

In addition, u depends continuously on f, i.e., if $f_n \to f$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ and u_n is associated with (f_n, ψ, g), then

$$u_n \to u \quad \text{in } W^{1,p}(\Omega), \qquad \text{for all } p,\ 1 < p < \frac{N}{N-1} a_0. \tag{1.11}$$

We notice that existence results for the obstacle problem in more general Orlicz-Sobolev spaces for Leray-Lions type operators with $L^1(\Omega)$ data have been obtained in [2]. Also in the L^1-framework for Orlicz-Sobolev spaces with a $N-$function satisfying the Δ_2-condition (see [1], p. 231), but not necessarily (1.5), the existence and uniqueness of an entropy solution to the obstacle problem with homogeneous boundary data $g = 0$ is given in [3], and with additional assumptions on the obstacle has been obtained earlier. We observe that also in Remark 3.2 of [3], for that case, a result similar to (1.10), improving the previous regularity result of [6] for the $p-$Laplacian under the unnecessary restriction $2 - 1/N < p < N$.

The next theorem extends the Lewy-Stampacchia inequalities for the entropy solution of the obstacle problem with f in $L^1(\Omega)$. This is particularly important to easily obtain the Hölder continuity of the gradient of the solution, in the case of bounded data, as an immediate consequence of the known results of [13] (see also [14]) for the Δ_A operator.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume that $(f - \Delta_A\psi)^+ \in L^1(\Omega)$, in particular if $\Delta_A\psi \in L^1(\Omega)$, the entropy solution u is such that $\Delta_A u \in L^1(\Omega)$ and the following Lewy-Stampacchia inequalities hold*

$$f - (f - \Delta_A\psi)^+ \leqslant \Delta_A u \leqslant f \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \Omega. \tag{1.12}$$

Moreover, if f and $(f - \Delta_A\psi)^+ \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, then $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$, and also $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$, provided that $g \in C^{1,\alpha}(\partial\Omega)$ and also $\partial\Omega$ is a $C^{1,\alpha}$ surface, for some $0 < \alpha < 1$.

We observe that the $C^{1,\alpha}$ regularity of the solution of the one and two obstacle problems for these type of degenerate operators was obtained in [14] for $C^{1,\alpha}$ obstacles.

The inequalities (1.12) and the $C^{1,\alpha}$ regularity are not enough to prove in all generality that the entropy solution of the obstacle problem also solves the semilinear equation

$$\Delta_A u - (\Delta_A\psi - f)\chi_{\{u=\psi\}} = f \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \Omega, \tag{1.13}$$

as, for instance, in the case of the Laplacian (see [18], for example). Here $\chi_{\{u=\psi\}}$ denotes the characteristic function of the set $\{u = \psi\}$, i.e. $\chi_{\{u=\psi\}}(x) = 1$ if $x \in \{u = \psi\}$, and $\chi_{\{u=\psi\}}(x) = 0$ if $x \in \{u > \psi\}$,.

However (1.13) holds, for example, when $\psi = 0$ and $0 < \lambda_0 \leq f \leq \Lambda_0$, as a consequence of the porosity of the free boundary (see [8]) that yields $(\partial\{u = \psi\}) \cap \Omega$ is of Lebesgue measure zero. In fact, the weaker regularity condition (1.13) enables us to show a first corollary on the stability of free boundaries, extending the results of [18] and [19].

Corollary 1.1. *Under the L^1 assumptions of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2, for f, f_n and (ψ, g), assume also that the limit entropy solution u satisfies (1.13) and suppose that*

$$\Delta_A \psi \neq f \quad a.e. \ in \ \ \Omega. \tag{1.14}$$

Then, the respective characteristic functions of the coincidence sets $\{u_n = \psi\}$ converges in the following sense

$$\chi_{\{u_n=\psi\}} \to \chi_{\{u=\psi\}} \quad in \quad L^s(\Omega) \quad for\ all \ \ s < \infty. \tag{1.15}$$

A third global property of entropy solutions of the obstacle problem is related to the monotonicity and $T-$accretivity of Δ_A in $L^1(\Omega)$.

Theorem 1.3. *Let the L^1 assumptions of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 hold for two sets of data $f_1, \psi, g)$ and $f_2, \psi, g)$ and denote by u_i, $\xi_i = \Delta_A u_i - f_i$, $i = 1, 2$, their respective entropy solutions. Assume moreover that $\psi \in W^{2,\infty}_{loc}(\Omega)$. Then we have*

$$\int_\Omega |\xi_1 - \xi_2| dx \leqslant \int_\Omega |f_1 - f_2| dx. \tag{1.16}$$

Similarly to earlier works for the $p-$Laplacian (see [18] for $p = 2$ and [19]), from this L^1 contraction property for the obstacle problem we can easily obtain an estimate for the stability of two coincidence sets $I_i = I(u_i) = \{u_i = \psi\}$, $i = 1, 2$, in terms of the Lebesgue measure $\mathcal{L}^N$ of their symmetric difference

$$I_1 \div I_2 = (I_1 \setminus I_2) \cup (I_2 \setminus I_1).$$

Corollary 1.2. *In addition to the assumptions of Theorem 1.3, suppose that both entropy solutions satisfy (1.13) and the data satisfy the local non-degeneracy condition, for some constant λ,*

$$\Delta_A \psi - f_i \leqslant -\lambda < 0, \quad a.e. \ in \quad \omega, \quad i = 1, 2 \tag{1.17}$$

in a measurable subset $\omega \subset \Omega$. Then we have

$$\mathcal{L}^N\big((I_1 \div I_2) \cap \omega\big) \leqslant \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_\Omega |f_1 - f_2| dx. \tag{1.18}$$

In order to prove local properties, we shall restrict ourselves to the case where

$$\psi = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad f \in L^\infty(\Omega). \tag{1.19}$$

We start by estimating the growth of the solution an its gradient in an open neighborhood $\omega \subset \Omega$ of a generic free boundary point $x_0 \in (\partial\{u > 0\}) \cap \omega$, where we shall assume the existence of two constants λ, Λ, such that

$$0 < \lambda_0 \leqslant f \leqslant \Lambda_0 \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \omega. \tag{1.20}$$

We denote by a^{-1} the inverse function of a and we introduce the associated complementary function $\widetilde{A}$:

$$\widetilde{A}(t) = \int_0^t a^{-1}(s)ds. \tag{1.21}$$

Then we have

Theorem 1.4. *Under the assumptions (1.20) and (1.21), the solution u to the obstacle problem, and its gradient have the following growth rates near a free boundary point $x_0 \in (\partial\{u > 0\}) \cap \Omega$*

$$0 \leqslant u(x) \leqslant C_0\widetilde{A}(|x - x_0|) \qquad \forall x \in \omega \tag{1.22}$$

$$|\nabla u(x)| \leqslant C_1 a^{-1}(|x - x_0|) \qquad \forall x \in \omega, \tag{1.23}$$

for positive constants C_0, C_1 depending on N, a_0, a_1, λ_0, Λ_0, and on the L^∞_{loc} and $C^{1,\alpha}_{loc}$ norms of u respectively.

In fact (1.22) was already proved in [8] and extends the well-known quadratic growth property observed by Caffarelli in the pioneering work [7] for the Laplacian and the corresponding $p/(p-1)$ growth for the $p-$Laplacian obtained in [12] for $1 < p < \infty$. The natural consequence (1.23) on the growth of the gradient was also extended to the $p-$Laplacian, but only for $p > 2$ in [15].
In order to obtain further regularity on the free boundary, we shall extend local L^2-estimates for the second derivatives of the solution obtained in [10], by assuming additionally

$$\nabla f \in \mathcal{M}^N_{loc}(\Omega), \tag{1.24}$$

where $\mathcal{M}^N_{loc}(\Omega)$ is the Morrey space (see [17] for definition of this space).

$$\frac{a(t)}{t} \quad \text{is monotone} \quad \text{for} \;\; 0 < t < t_*, \tag{1.25}$$

for some $t_* > 0$, where the monotonicity near zero may be either non-increasing or non-decreasing.

Theorem 1.5. *Under the assumptions (1.20)-(1.21) and (1.24)-(1.25), the free boundary of the $A-$Obstacle problem is locally of finite Hausdorff measure. More precisely, if $x_0 \in (\partial\{u > 0\}) \cap \omega$ and $\omega \subset \Omega$, then there exists a positive constant C_0 such that*

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\partial\{u > 0\} \cap B_r(x_0)) \leqslant C_0 r^{n-1}, \quad B_r(x_0) \subset \omega.$$

This result is a natural extension of the same property known for the $p-$Obstacle problem, obtained in [7] for $p = 2$ and recently in [15] for $p > 2$. It is new for the case $1 < p < 2$.

As a consequence of this theorem and general results from geometric measure theory, the coincidence set $I(u) = \{u = 0\}$ is a set of finite perimeter and, hence, the free boundary consists, up to a "small" singular set, of a union of an at most countable number of C^1 hypersurfaces.

The arguments on the growth of the solution near the free boundary, that are used to prove Theorem 1.5, also yield another stability result of the coincidence set $I(u) = \{u = 0\}$, in terms of L^∞ variations of the solution, extending the results of [7] and [15].

Corollary 1.3. *If u_1 and u_2 are two local solutions of the $A-$Obstacle problem, under the conditions of Theorem 1.5, then there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$\mathcal{L}^N\big((I(u_1) \div I(u_2)) \cap \omega'\big) \leqslant C\widetilde{A}^{-1}\big(||u_1 - u_2||_{\infty,\omega}\big), \quad \omega' \subset\subset \omega. \tag{1.26}$$

For each $\epsilon > 0$, such that $||u_1 - u_2||_{\infty,\omega} < \widetilde{A}^{-1}(\epsilon)$, we have

$$(I(u_2) \cap \omega')_{(-C\epsilon)} \subset I(u_1) \cap \omega' \subset \{u_2 < \widetilde{A}^{-1}(\epsilon)\}, \tag{1.27}$$

where $(I(u_2) \cap \omega')_{(-C\epsilon)} = \{x \in I(u_2) \cap \omega' \ : \ d(x, \{u_2 > 0\})$.

2 Some Auxiliary Results

We start by recalling some useful inequalities that follow from the assumption (1.5) (see [13], [16]) :

$$\frac{ta(t)}{1 + a_1} \leqslant A(t) \leqslant ta(t) \qquad \forall t \geqslant 0, \tag{2.1}$$

$$sa(t) \leqslant ta(t) + sa(s) \quad \forall s, t \geqslant 0, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\min(s^{a_0}, s^{a_1})a(t) \leqslant a(st) \leqslant \max(s^{a_0}, s^{a_1})a(t) \quad \forall s, t \geqslant 0, \tag{2.3}$$

$$\min(s^{1+a_0}, s^{1+a_1})\frac{A(t)}{1 + a_1} \leqslant A(st) \leqslant (1 + a_1)\max(s^{1+a_0}, s^{1+a_1})A(t) \quad \forall s, t \geqslant 0, \tag{2.4}$$

$$\min(s^{1/a_0}, s^{1/a_1})a^{-1}(t) \leqslant a^{-1}(st) \leqslant \max(s^{1/a_0}, s^{1/a_1})a^{-1}(t) \quad \forall s, t \geqslant 0, \tag{2.5}$$

$$\frac{a_0}{1 + a_0}ta^{-1}(t) \leqslant \widetilde{A}(t) \leqslant ta^{-1}(t) \qquad \forall t \geqslant 0. \tag{2.6}$$

We also have the following monotonicity inequality (see [9] and [11])

$$\Big(\frac{a(|\xi|)}{|\xi|}\xi-\frac{a(|\zeta|)}{|\zeta|}\zeta\Big).(\xi-\zeta)\geqslant C(A,N)|\xi-\zeta|^2\frac{a\big((|\xi|^2+|\zeta|^2)^{1/2}\big)}{(|\xi|^2+|\zeta|^2)^{1/2}}\qquad\forall(\xi,\zeta)\in\mathbb{R}^{2N}\setminus\{0\}.\tag{2.7}$$

We start by establishing the Lewy-Stampacchia inequalities for the variational solution.

Proposition 2.1. *Assume that* $f,(f-\Delta_A\psi)^+\in L^\infty(\Omega)$. *Then the variational solution* u *of the obstacle problem associated with* (f,ψ,g) *satisfies the Lewy-Stampacchia inequalities*

$$f-(f-\Delta_A\psi)^+\leqslant\Delta_A u\leqslant f\quad a.e.\ in\quad\Omega.$$

Proof. Let $\epsilon\in(0,1)$, $h=(f-\Delta_A\psi)^+$ and consider the following approximated problem

$$(P_\epsilon)\begin{cases}\text{Find } u_\epsilon\in g+W_0^{1,A}(\Omega)\text{ such that }:\\ -\Delta_A u_\epsilon=-f+h(1-H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon-\psi))\ \text{ in }\ (W^{1,A}(\Omega))',\end{cases}$$

where $H_\epsilon(t)=(T_\epsilon(t))^+$.
Using the standard theory of monotone operators and Schauder fixed point theorem, one can prove that (P_ϵ) has a solution. Using the monotonicity of H_ϵ and the inequality (2.7), one can also prove the uniqueness of this solution. Moreover we have

$$|\Delta_A u_\epsilon|_\infty=|f-(1-H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon-\psi))h|_\infty\leqslant|f|_\infty+|h|_\infty.\tag{2.8}$$

We claim that

$$u_\epsilon-\epsilon\leqslant u\leqslant u_\epsilon\quad\text{a.e. in }\ \Omega.\tag{2.9}$$

First we show that $u_\epsilon\in K_{\psi,g}$. For this purpose, it is enough to verify that $u_\epsilon\geqslant\psi$ a.e. in Ω. Since $(\psi-g)^+\in W_0^{1,A}(\Omega)$, $(\psi-u_\epsilon)^+$ is a test function for (P_ϵ). We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega\nabla_A u_\epsilon.\nabla(\psi-u_\epsilon)^+dx&=\int_\Omega(-f+(1-H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon-\psi))h)(\psi-u_\epsilon)^+dx\\&=\int_\Omega(-f+h)(\psi-u_\epsilon)^+dx.\end{aligned}$$

This leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega\big(\nabla_A\psi-\nabla_A u_\epsilon\big).\nabla(\psi-u_\epsilon)^+dx&=\int_\Omega(f-\Delta_A\psi-(f-\Delta_A\psi)^+)(\psi-u_\epsilon)^+dx\\&=-\int_\Omega(f-\Delta_A\psi)^-(\psi-u_\epsilon)^+dx\leqslant0.\end{aligned}$$

Using (2.7), we deduce that $\nabla(\psi-u_\epsilon)^+=0$ a.e. in Ω. But because $(\psi-u_\epsilon)^+=(\psi-g)^+=0$ on $\partial\Omega$, we obtain $(\psi-u_\epsilon)^+=0$ a.e. in Ω. Hence we have proved that $u_\epsilon\geqslant\psi$ a.e. in Ω.

Next we prove that $u\leqslant u_\epsilon$ a.e. in Ω. To do this we use $u-(u-u_\epsilon)^+$ as a test function for the obstacle problem associated with (f,ψ,g). We obtain

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_A u.\nabla(u-u_\epsilon)^+dx \quad\leqslant\quad \int_\Omega -f(u-u_\epsilon)^+dx. \tag{2.10}$$

Using $(u-u_\epsilon)^+$ as a test function for the problem (P_ϵ), we obtain

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_A u_\epsilon.\nabla(u-u_\epsilon)^+dx \quad=\quad \int_\Omega(-f+(1-H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon-\psi))h)(u-u_\epsilon)^+dx. \tag{2.11}$$

Subtracting (2.10) from (2.11), we obtain

$$\int_\Omega \big(\nabla_A u-\nabla_A u_\epsilon\big).\nabla(u-u_\epsilon)^+dx\leqslant-\int_\Omega h(1-H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon-\psi))(u-u_\epsilon)^+dx\leqslant 0.$$

Using the fact that we have $(u-u_\epsilon)^+=(g-g)^+=0$ on $\partial\Omega$, we conclude as above that $(u-u_\epsilon)^+=0$ a.e. in Ω, or equivalently that $u_\epsilon\geqslant u$ a.e. in Ω.

Now we prove that $u_\epsilon-\epsilon\leqslant u$ a.e. in Ω. To do this we use $u+(u_\epsilon-u-\epsilon)^+$ as a test function for the obstacle problem associated with (f,ψ,g) and $(u_\epsilon-u-\epsilon)^+$ as a test function for the problem (P_ϵ). We obtain

$$-\int_\Omega \nabla_A u.\nabla(u_\epsilon-u-\epsilon)^+dx\leqslant\int_\Omega f(u_\epsilon-u-\epsilon)^+dx \tag{2.12}$$

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_A u_\epsilon.\nabla(u_\epsilon-u-\epsilon)^+dx=\int_\Omega(-f+(1-H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon-\psi))h)(u_\epsilon-u-\epsilon)^+dx. \tag{2.13}$$

Adding (2.12) and (2.13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \big(\nabla_A(u_\epsilon-\epsilon)-\nabla_A u\big).\nabla(u_\epsilon-\epsilon-u)^+dx \quad&\leqslant\quad \int_\Omega h(1-H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon-\psi))(u_\epsilon-\epsilon-u)^+dx\\ &=0.\end{aligned}$$

Using (2.7) and the fact that we have $(u_\epsilon-\epsilon-u)^+=(g-\epsilon-g)^+=0$ on $\partial\Omega$, we conclude as above that $(u_\epsilon-\epsilon-u)^+=0$ a.e. in Ω. This means that $u_\epsilon-\epsilon\geqslant u$ a.e. in Ω.

Now we deduce from (2.9), that u_ϵ converges to u in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. We also deduce from (2.8) that $u_\epsilon\in C^{1,\alpha}_{loc}(\Omega)$ and bounded in each $C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega'})$ for each $\Omega'\subset\subset\Omega$ (see [13]). There exists therefore a subsequence such that $u_\epsilon \to u$ in $C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega'})$ for each $\Omega' \subset\subset \Omega$ and each $\beta < \alpha$.

Since we have

$$f - h \leqslant \Delta_A u_\epsilon \leqslant f \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \Omega,$$

we get for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$, $\varphi \geqslant 0$

$$\int_\Omega -f\varphi dx \leqslant \int_\Omega \nabla_A u_\epsilon.\nabla\varphi dx \leqslant \int_\Omega (-f+h)\varphi dx.$$

Letting $\epsilon \to 0$ and using the $C^{1,\beta}_{loc}$ convergence of u_ϵ to u, we get

$$\int_\Omega -f\varphi dx \leqslant \int_\Omega \nabla_A u.\nabla\varphi dx \leqslant \int_\Omega (-f+h)\varphi dx.$$

Hence we obtain

$$f - (f - \Delta_A \psi)^+ \leqslant \Delta_A u \leqslant f \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \Omega.$$

□

Let us now give a definition that will be needed in the next proposition and later on.

Definition 2.1. *Let $p > 1$ and $w \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. We say that $w(x) > 0$ in the sense of $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ if there exists a neighborhood $\vartheta_x \subset \Omega$ of x and a nonnegative function $\zeta \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ such that $\zeta(x) > 0$ and $w \geqslant \zeta$ a.e. in ϑ_x. This definition is clearly independent of ζ and one can verify that the set $\{w > 0\}$ is an open set of Ω. Similarly we define $\{w < 0\}$.*

Proposition 2.2. *Let u be the entropy solution of the obstacle problem associated with (f, ψ, g). Assume that we have $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for some $p > 1$. Then we have*

$$\Delta_A u = f \quad \textit{a.e. in} \quad \{u > \psi\}.$$

Proof. According to Definition 2.1, we denote by Λ the open set $\{u > \psi\}$ and we argue as in [20]. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\Lambda)$, $s > |g|_\infty, |\psi|_\infty$, and $\epsilon > 0$ small enough so that $v = T_s(u) \pm \epsilon\varphi \in K_{\psi,g} \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. Using v as a test function for the obstacle problem associated with (f, ψ, g), we obtain

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_A u.\nabla(T_t(T_s(u) \pm \epsilon\varphi - u))dx \geqslant \int_\Omega -fT_t(T_s(u) \pm \epsilon\varphi - u)dx$$

which can be written as

$$\pm\epsilon \int_{\{|T_s(u)\pm\epsilon\varphi - u| < t\}} \nabla_A u.\nabla\varphi dx \geqslant \int_\Omega -fT_t(T_s(u) \pm \epsilon\varphi - u)dx.$$

Choosing $t > \epsilon|\varphi|_\infty$ and letting $s \to \infty$, we get

$$\pm\epsilon \int_{\{|\epsilon\varphi|<t\}} \nabla_A u.\nabla\varphi dx \geqslant \int_\Omega -fT_t(\pm\epsilon\varphi)dx = \pm\epsilon \int_\Omega -f\varphi dx.$$

Hence we get

$$\int_\Lambda \nabla_A u.\nabla\varphi dx = \int_\Omega -f\varphi dx$$

or $\Delta_A u = f \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \Lambda.$ □

Proposition 2.3. *Let the assumptions of Proposition 2.1 hold for two sets of data* $f_1, \psi, g)$ *and* $f_2, \psi, g)$ *and denote by* u_i, $\xi_i = \Delta_A u_i - f_i$, $i = 1, 2$, *their respective variational solutions. Assume moreover that* $\psi \in W^{2,\infty}_{loc}(\Omega)$. *Then we have*

$$\int_\Omega |\xi_1 - \xi_2| dx \leqslant \int_\Omega |f_1 - f_2| dx. \tag{2.14}$$

We need two lemmas for the variational solution u_ϵ of the A_ϵ-obstacle problem associated with (f, ψ, g), where A_ϵ is associated to the function $a_\epsilon(t) = \dfrac{ta(\sqrt{\epsilon + t^2})}{\sqrt{\epsilon + t^2}}$. Note that a_ϵ satisfies (1.5) with the same constants a_0, a_1. In the first lemma, we establish a regularity result for u_ϵ.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that* $f \in L^\infty_{loc}(\Omega)$ *and* $\psi \in W^{2,\infty}_{loc}(\Omega)$. *If* u_ϵ *is the variational solution of the* A_ϵ*-obstacle problem associated with* (f, ψ, g), *then we have* $u_\epsilon \in W^{2,2}_{loc}(\Omega)$. *In particular we have* $\nabla_{A_\epsilon} u_\epsilon \in W^{1,2}_{loc}(\Omega)$.

Proof. Note that u_ϵ satisfies the Lewy-Stampacchia inequalities proven in Proposition 2.1

$$f - (f - \Delta_{A_\epsilon}\psi)^+ \leqslant \Delta_{A_\epsilon} u_\epsilon \leqslant f \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \Omega. \tag{2.15}$$

Moreover, since $\psi \in W^{2,\infty}_{loc}(\Omega)$, one has

$$\triangle_{A_\epsilon}\psi = \frac{a_\epsilon(|\nabla\psi|)}{|\nabla\psi|}\Big[\triangle\psi + \Big(\frac{|\nabla\psi| a'_\epsilon(|\nabla\psi|)}{a_\epsilon(|\nabla\psi|)} - 1\Big)\frac{D^2\psi.\nabla\psi}{|\nabla\psi|^2}.\nabla\psi\Big].$$

Using (1.5), we obtain for any ball $B \subset\subset \Omega$ and $x \in B$

$$\begin{aligned} |\triangle_{A_\epsilon}\psi(x)| &\leqslant \frac{a((\epsilon + |\nabla\psi(x)|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + |\nabla\psi(x)|^2)^{1/2}}[|\triangle\psi(x)| + (a_1 - 1)|D^2\psi(x)|] \\ &\leqslant a_1 \frac{a((\epsilon + |\nabla\psi|^2_{\infty,B})^{1/2})}{\epsilon}|D^2\psi|_{\infty,B}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\triangle_{A_\epsilon}\psi \in L^\infty_{loc}(\Omega)$. Taking into account (2.15), we deduce that $\triangle_{A_\epsilon}u_\epsilon \in L^\infty_{loc}(\Omega)$, which in turn leads to $u_\epsilon \in W^{2,2}_{loc}(\Omega)$ (see [10]). Now since

$$D_i(\nabla_{A_\epsilon}u_\epsilon) = \frac{a_\epsilon(|\nabla u_\epsilon|)}{|\nabla u_\epsilon|}\Big[\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i} + \Big(\frac{|\nabla u_\epsilon| a'_\epsilon(|\nabla u_\epsilon|)}{a_\epsilon(|\nabla u_\epsilon|)} - 1\Big)\frac{\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}.\nabla u_\epsilon}{|\nabla u_\epsilon|^2}.\nabla u_\epsilon\Big],$$

we get by (1.5)

$$|D_i(\nabla_{A_\epsilon}u_\epsilon)| \leqslant a_1 \frac{a((\epsilon+|\nabla u_\epsilon(x)|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon+|\nabla u_\epsilon(x)|^2)^{1/2}}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|.$$

Hence $\nabla_{A_\epsilon}u_\epsilon \in W^{1,2}_{loc}(\Omega)$. □

Lemma 2.2. *Let the assumptions of Lemma 2.1 hold for two sets of data* $f_1, \psi, g)$ *and* $f_2, \psi, g)$ *and denote by* u^i_ϵ, $\xi^i_\epsilon = \Delta_A u^i_\epsilon - f_i$, $i = 1, 2$, *their respective variational solutions. Then we have*

$$\int_\Omega |\xi^1_\epsilon - \xi^2_\epsilon|dx \leqslant \int_\Omega |f_1 - f_2|dx. \tag{2.16}$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, we have $\Delta_{A_\epsilon}u^i_\epsilon \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Integrating by parts and using the monotonicity of $\dfrac{a((\epsilon+|\xi|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon+|\xi|^2)^{1/2}}\xi$, we get for $\delta > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega (\Delta_{A_\epsilon}u^1_\epsilon - \Delta_{A_\epsilon}u^2_\epsilon).(T_\delta(u^1_\epsilon - u^2_\epsilon))dx &= -\int_\Omega (\nabla_{A_\epsilon}u^1_\epsilon - \nabla_{A_\epsilon}u^2_\epsilon).\nabla(T_\epsilon(u^1_\epsilon - u^2_\epsilon))dx \\ &= -\int_\Omega T'_\delta(u_1 - u_2)(\nabla_{A_\epsilon}u^1_\epsilon - \nabla_{A_\epsilon}u^2_\epsilon).(\nabla u^1_\epsilon - \nabla u^2_\epsilon)dx \leqslant 0.\end{aligned}$$

Letting $\delta \to 0$, we get for $T_0(s) = sign(s) = s/|s|$ if $s \neq 0$, and $T_0(0) = 0$

$$\int_\Omega (\Delta_{A_\epsilon}u^1_\epsilon - \Delta_{A_\epsilon}u^2_\epsilon).(T_0(u^1_\epsilon - u^2_\epsilon))dx \leqslant 0. \tag{2.17}$$

Note that

$$(\xi^2_\epsilon - \xi^1_\epsilon)(u^2_\epsilon - u^1_\epsilon) \geqslant 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \ \Omega. \tag{2.18}$$

Indeed since $\{u^2_\epsilon > u^1_\epsilon\} \subset \{u^2_\epsilon > \psi\}$, we have $\xi^2_\epsilon = 0$ a.e. in $\{u^2_\epsilon > u^1_\epsilon\}$. It follows that $(\xi^2_\epsilon - \xi^1_\epsilon)(u^2_\epsilon - u^1_\epsilon) = -\xi^1_\epsilon(u^2_\epsilon - u^1_\epsilon) \geqslant 0$ a.e. in $\{u^1_\epsilon > u^2_\epsilon\}$, since $\xi^1_\epsilon \leqslant 0$ a.e. in Ω by Proposition 2.1. Similarly, we show that $(\xi^2_\epsilon - \xi^1_\epsilon)(u^2_\epsilon - u^1_\epsilon) \geqslant 0$ a.e. in $\{u^2_\epsilon < u^1_\epsilon\}$. Hence (2.18) holds.

We know from Lemma 2.1 that we have $\nabla_{A_\epsilon}u^i_\epsilon \in W^{1,2}_{loc}(\Omega)$. Since $\nabla_{A_\epsilon}u^2_\epsilon = \nabla_{A_\epsilon}u^1_\epsilon$ a.e. in $\{u^2_\epsilon = u^1_\epsilon\}$, we obtain $div(\nabla_{A_\epsilon}u^2_\epsilon) = div(\nabla_{A_\epsilon}u^1_\epsilon)$ a.e. in $\{u^2_\epsilon = u^1_\epsilon\}$. Hence we have

$$\xi^2_\epsilon - \xi^1_\epsilon = f_1 - f_2 + \Delta_{A_\epsilon}u^2_\epsilon - \Delta_{A_\epsilon}u^1_\epsilon = f_1 - f_2 \quad \text{a.e. in } \ \{u^2_\epsilon = u^1_\epsilon\}.$$

Taking into account (2.18), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega|\xi_\epsilon^1-\xi_\epsilon^2|dx &= \int_{\{u_\epsilon^2=u_\epsilon^1\}}|\xi_\epsilon^1-\xi_\epsilon^2|dx+\int_{\{u_\epsilon^2>u_\epsilon^1\}}|\xi_\epsilon^1-\xi_\epsilon^2|dx+\int_{\{u_\epsilon^2<u_\epsilon^1\}}|\xi_\epsilon^1-\xi_\epsilon^2|dx\\
&= \int_{\{u_\epsilon^2=u_\epsilon^1\}}|f_1-f_2|dx+\int_{\{u_\epsilon^2>u_\epsilon^1\}}(\xi_2-\xi_1)dx+\int_{\{u_\epsilon^2<u_\epsilon^1\}}(\xi_1-\xi_2)dx\\
&= \int_{\{u_\epsilon^2=u_\epsilon^1\}}|f_1-f_2|dx+\int_{\{u_\epsilon^2>u_\epsilon^1\}}(f_1-f_2+\Delta_{A_\epsilon}u_\epsilon^2-\Delta_{A_\epsilon}u_\epsilon^1)dx\\
&\quad+\int_{\{u_\epsilon^2<u_\epsilon^1\}}(f_2-f_1+\Delta_{A_\epsilon}u_\epsilon^1-\Delta_{A_\epsilon}u_\epsilon^2)dx\\
&= \int_{\{u_\epsilon^2=u_\epsilon^1\}}|f_1-f_2|dx+\int_{\{u_\epsilon^2>u_\epsilon^1\}}(f_1-f_2)dx+\int_{\{u_\epsilon^2<u_\epsilon^1\}}(f_2-f_1)dx\\
&\quad+\int_{\{u_\epsilon^2>u_\epsilon^1\}}(\Delta_{A_\epsilon}u_\epsilon^2-\Delta_{A_\epsilon}u_\epsilon^1)dx+\int_{\{u_\epsilon^2<u_\epsilon^1\}}(\Delta_{A_\epsilon}u_\epsilon^1-\Delta_{A_\epsilon}u_\epsilon^2)dx. \qquad (2.19)
\end{aligned}$$

Taking into account (2.17) and (2.19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega|\xi_\epsilon^1-\xi_\epsilon^2|dx &\leqslant \int_\Omega|f_1-f_2|dx+\int_\Omega(\Delta_{A_\epsilon}u_\epsilon^1-\Delta_{A_\epsilon}u_\epsilon^2).(T_0(u_\epsilon^1-u_\epsilon^2))dx\\
&\leqslant \int_\Omega|f_1-f_2|dx.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 2.3. Let u_1, u_2 be two variational solutions of the $A-$obstacle problem associated with (f_1,ψ,g) and (f_2,ψ,g). We denote by $u_\epsilon^1, u_\epsilon^2$ the variational solutions of the $A_\epsilon-$obstacle problem associated with (f_1,ψ,g) and (f_2,ψ,g) respectively. We observe that we can prove, as in the proof of Lemma 2.3 of [10], that there exists a subsequence (ϵ_n) such that $u_{\epsilon_n}^1$ and $u_{\epsilon_n}^2$ converge in $W^{1,A}(\Omega)$ respectively to u_1 and u_2. Let $\xi_{\epsilon_n}^i=\Delta_{A_{\epsilon_n}}u_{\epsilon_n}^i-f_i$, $i=1,2$. Then we have by Lemma 2.2

$$\int_\Omega|\xi_{\epsilon_n}^1-\xi_{\epsilon_n}^2|dx\leqslant\int_\Omega|f_1-f_2|dx. \qquad (2.20)$$

Let O be an open set such that $O\subset\subset\Omega$. Let $\delta>0$, and consider the open set $O_\delta=\{x\in O\ :\ |\nabla\psi(x)|>\delta\}$. Note that we can assume, without loss of generality, that we have $\epsilon_n<\delta$ for all $n\geqslant1$. Using (1.5) and arguing as in the proof of Lemma 2.1, we obtain for $n\geqslant1$ and $x\in O_\delta$

$$\begin{aligned}
|\triangle_{A_{\epsilon_n}}\psi(x)| &\leqslant \frac{a((\epsilon_n+|\nabla\psi(x)|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon_n+|\nabla\psi(x)|^2)^{1/2}}[|\triangle\psi(x)|+(a_1-1)|D^2\psi(x)|]\\
&\leqslant a_1\frac{a((\delta+|\nabla\psi|^2)^{1/2})}{|\nabla\psi(x)|}|D^2\psi|_{\infty,O}\\
&\leqslant a_1\frac{a(\sqrt{2}|\nabla\psi|_{\infty,B})}{\delta}|D^2\psi|_{\infty,O}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\triangle_{A_{\epsilon_n}}\psi$ is bounded uniformly in $L^\infty(O_\delta)$. Taking into account (2.15), we deduce that $\triangle_{A_{\epsilon_n}}u^i_{\epsilon_n}$ are bounded uniformly in $L^\infty(O_\delta)$.
Consider now the measurable set $O_0 = \{x \in O \ : \ \nabla\psi(x) = 0\}$. Since $\psi \in W^{2,\infty}(O)$, we have $\Delta_{A_{\epsilon_n}}\psi = 0$ a.e. in O_0. We deduce from (2.15) that $-f_i^- \leqslant \Delta_{A_{\epsilon_n}}u^i_{\epsilon_n} \leqslant f_i$ a.e. in O_0. Therefore $\triangle_{A_{\epsilon_n}}u^i_{\epsilon_n}$ are bounded uniformly in $L^\infty(O_0)$.
We conclude that $\triangle_{A_{\epsilon_n}}u^i_{\epsilon_n}$ are bounded uniformly in $L^\infty(O_0 \cup O_\delta)$. Since moreover $\nabla_{A_{\epsilon_n}}u^i_{\epsilon_n}$ converges to $\nabla_A u_i$ in $L^{\widetilde{A}}(\Omega)$, we deduce that we have up to a subsequence

$$\Delta_{A_{\epsilon_n}}u^i_{\epsilon_n} \ \rightharpoonup \ \Delta_A u^i \quad \text{weakly-* in } \ L^\infty(O_0 \cup O_\delta),$$

and therefore

$$\Delta_{A_{\epsilon_n}}u^i_{\epsilon_n} \ \rightharpoonup \ \Delta_A u^i \quad \text{in} \ \ L^1(O_0 \cup O_\delta).$$

It follows that

$$\xi^i_{\epsilon_n} \ \rightharpoonup \ \xi_i \quad \text{in} \ \ L^1(O_0 \cup O_\delta). \tag{2.21}$$

Using the semicontinuity of the norm $||.||_{L^1(O_0\cup O_\delta)}$, we get from (2.20)-(2.21), since $\int_{O_0\cup O_\delta}|\xi^1_{\epsilon_n} - \xi^2_{\epsilon_n}|dx \leqslant \int_\Omega |\xi^1_{\epsilon_n} - \xi^2_{\epsilon_n}|dx$

$$\int_{O_0\cup O_\delta}|\xi_1 - \xi_2|dx \leqslant \liminf_{n\to\infty}\int_{O_0\cup O_\delta}|\xi^1_{\epsilon_n} - \xi^2_{\epsilon_n}|dx \leqslant \int_\Omega |f_1 - f_2|dx.$$

Given that O and δ are arbitrary, we obtain

$$\int_\Omega |\xi_1 - \xi_2|dx \leqslant \int_\Omega |f_1 - f_2|dx.$$

□

3 Lemmas on Entropy Solutions

Since variational solutions, in particular those obtained with $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, are also entropy solutions, in this section we establish several auxiliary results on convergence of sequences of entropy solutions when $f_n \to f$ in $L^1(\Omega)$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $||f_n||_1 \leqslant ||f||_1 + 1$.We start with an a priori estimate.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $v_0 \in K_{\psi,g} \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$, and let u be an entropy solution of the obstacle problem associated with (f, ψ, g). Then we have*

$$\int_\Omega A(|\nabla T_t(u)|)dx \leqslant (1 + a_1)2^{1+a_1}\int_\Omega A(|\nabla v_0|)dx + 2t||f||_1, \quad \forall t > 0.$$

Proof. Using v_0 as a test function for (1.9), we get for $t > 0$

$$\int_{\{|v_0-u|<t\}} \nabla_A u.(\nabla v_0 - \nabla u))dx \geqslant \int_\Omega -fT_t(v_0-u)dx$$

or

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\{|v_0-u|<t\}} |\nabla u|a(|\nabla u|)dx &\leqslant \int_{\{|v_0-u|<t\}} \nabla_A u.\nabla v_0 dx + \int_\Omega fT_t(v_0-u)dx \\ &\leqslant \int_{\{|v_0-u|<t\}} a(|\nabla u|).|\nabla v_0|dx. + t||f||_1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Using inequalities (2.2)-(2.3), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\{|v_0-u|<t\}} a(|\nabla u|).|\nabla v_0|dx &\leqslant \frac{1}{2}\int_{\{|v_0-u|<t\}} |\nabla u|a(|\nabla u|)dx + \int_{\{|v_0-u|<t\}} |\nabla v_0|a(2|\nabla v_0|)dx \\ &\leqslant \frac{1}{2}\int_{\{|v_0-u|<t\}} |\nabla u|a(|\nabla u|)dx + 2^{a_1}\int_{\{|v_0-u|<t\}} |\nabla v_0|a(|\nabla v_0|)dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Combining (3.1) and (3.2), we obtain

$$\int_{\{|v_0-u|<t\}} |\nabla u|a(|\nabla u|)dx \leqslant 2^{1+a_1}\int_{\{|v_0-u|<t\}} |\nabla v_0|a(|\nabla v_0|)dx + 2t||f||_1. \tag{3.3}$$

Replacing t by $t+|v_0|_\infty$ in (3.3) and using the fact that $\{|u| < t\} \subset \{|v_0-u| < t+|v_0|_\infty\}$, we obtain

$$\int_{\{|u|<t\}} |\nabla u|a(|\nabla u|)dx \leqslant 2^{1+a_1}\int_\Omega |\nabla v_0|a(|\nabla v_0|)dx + 2t||f||_1.$$

Taking into account (2.1), we get the result. □

In the rest of this section, let (u_n) be a sequence of entropy solutions of the obstacle problem associated with (f_n, ψ, g) and assume that

$$f_n \to f \quad \text{in} \quad L^1(\Omega). \tag{3.4}$$

Lemma 3.2. *There exists a measurable function u such that*

$$\begin{aligned} u_n &\to u \quad \textit{in measure,} \\ T_k(u_n) &\rightharpoonup T_k(u) \quad \textit{weakly in } W^{1,A}(\Omega) \\ T_k(u_n) &\to T_k(u) \quad \textit{strongly in } L^A(\Omega) \textit{ and a.e. in } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let s, t and ϵ be positive numbers. It is easy to verify that we have for every $n, m \geqslant 1$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}^N(\{|u_n - u_m| > s\}) &\leqslant \mathcal{L}^N(\{|u_n| > t\}) + \mathcal{L}^N(\{|u_m| > t\}) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{L}^N(\{|T_t(u_n) - T_t(u_m)| > s\}). \qquad (3.5)\end{aligned}$$

Moreover we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}^N(\{|u_n| > t\}) &= \frac{1}{A(t)} \int_{\{|u_n|>t\}} A(t)dx \\ &\leqslant \frac{1}{A(t)} \int_\Omega A(|T_t(u_n)|)dx. \qquad (3.6)\end{aligned}$$

Since $v_0 = g + (\psi - g)^+ \in K_{\psi,g} \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$, we deduce from Lemma 3.1 that

$$\int_\Omega A(|\nabla T_t(u_n)|)dx = \int_{\{|u|<t\}} A(|\nabla u_n|)dx \leqslant (1 + a_1)2^{1+a_1} \int_\Omega A(|\nabla v_0|)dx + 2t||f||_1. \tag{3.7}$$

Using the convexity of A, Poincaré's inequality, the fact that $T_t(u_n) - T_t(g) \in W_0^{1,A}(\Omega)$, and (2.4), we deduce from (3.6)-(3.7) for every $t > |g|_\infty$ and for some positive constant C independent of n and t

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}^N(\{|u_n| > t\}) &\leqslant \frac{C}{A(t)} \int_\Omega (A(|\nabla g|) + A(|\nabla \psi|))dx + \frac{2t}{A(t)}||f||_1 \\ &\leqslant \frac{Ct + C}{A(t)}.\end{aligned}$$

We deduce that there exists $t_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}^N(\{|u_n| > t\}) < \frac{\epsilon}{3} \qquad \forall t \geqslant t_\epsilon, \quad \forall n \geqslant 1. \tag{3.8}$$

Now we have as in (3.6)

$$\mathcal{L}^N(\{|T_{t_\epsilon}(u_n) - T_{t_\epsilon}(u_m)| > s\}) \leqslant \frac{1}{A(s)} \int_\Omega A(|T_{t_\epsilon}(u_n) - T_{t_\epsilon}(u_m)|)dx. \tag{3.9}$$

Using (3.7) again, we see that $(T_{t_\epsilon}(u_n))$ is a bounded sequence in $W^{1,A}(\Omega)$. It follows that up to a subsequence $(T_{t_\epsilon}(u_n))$ converges strongly in $L^A(\Omega)$. Taking into account (3.9), there exists $n_0 = n_0(t_\epsilon, s) \geqslant 1$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}^N(\{|T_{t_\epsilon}(u_n) - T_{t_\epsilon}(u_m)| > s\}) < \frac{\epsilon}{3} \quad \forall n, m \geqslant n_0. \tag{3.10}$$

Combining (3.5), (3.8) and (3.10), we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}^N(\{|u_n - u_m| > s\}) < \epsilon \qquad \forall n, m \geqslant n_0.$$

Hence (u_n) is a Cauchy sequence in measure, and therefore there exists a measurable function u such that $u_n \to u$ in measure. The remainder of the lemma is a consequence of the fact that $(T_k(u_n))$ is a bounded sequence in $W^{1,A}(\Omega)$. □

Lemma 3.3. *Let u be an entropy solution of the obstacle problem associated with (f, ψ, g). Then we have for every $t > 0$*

$$\lim_{h\to\infty} \int_{\{h \leqslant |u| \leqslant h+t\}} A(|\nabla u|)dx = 0.$$

Proof. Let $t, h > 0$ and u be an entropy solution of the obstacle problem associated with (f, ψ, g). For $h \geqslant |g|_\infty, |\psi|_\infty$, it is easy to check that $T_h(u)$ is a test function for (1.9). We obtain

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_A u.\nabla(T_t(u - T_h(u)))dx \leqslant \int_\Omega -fT_t(u - T_h(u))dx$$

or

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \displaystyle\int_{\{h \leqslant |u| \leqslant h+t\}} |\nabla u| a(|\nabla u|)dx & \leqslant & t \displaystyle\int_{\{|u|>h\}} |f|dx \quad \to \quad 0, \\ & & \text{as } \ h \to \infty. \end{array}$$

We conclude by taking into account (2.1). □

Proposition 3.1. *There exists a subsequence of (u_n) and a measurable function u such that for each $p \in \big(1, \frac{N}{N-1}a_0\big)$, we have*

$$u_n \quad \to \quad u \quad \textit{strongly in} \quad W^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

If moreover $a_1 < \frac{N}{N-1}a_0$, then

$$\nabla_A u_n \quad \to \quad \nabla_A u \quad \textit{strongly in} \quad L^1(\Omega).$$

To prove Proposition 3.1, we need two preliminary lemmas.

Lemma 3.4. *There exists a subsequence of (u_n) such that for each $p \in \big(1, \frac{N}{N-1}a_0\big)$, we have*

$$\begin{array}{lll} u_n & \rightharpoonup & u \quad \textit{weakly in } W^{1,p}(\Omega) \\ u_n & \to & u \quad \textit{strongly in } L^p(\Omega). \end{array}$$

Proof. Let $k > 0$ and $n \geqslant 1$ and define $D_k = \{|u_n| \leqslant k\}$ and $B_k = \{k \leqslant |u_n| < k+1\}$. Using Lemma 3.1 with $v_0 = g + (\psi - g)^+$, we obtain

$$\int_{D_k} A(|\nabla u_n|)dx \leqslant 2^{1+a_1}(1 + a_1) \int_\Omega A(|\nabla v_0|)dx + 2k||f||_1. \tag{3.11}$$

Using the function $T_k(u_n)$ for $k > |g|_\infty, |\psi|_\infty$, as a test function for the problem associated with (f_n, ψ, g), we obtain

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_A u_n . \nabla(T_1(u_n - T_k(u_n)))dx \leqslant \int_\Omega -f_n T_1(u_n - T_k(u_n))dx$$

or

$$\int_{B_k} |\nabla u_n| a(|\nabla u_n|)dx \leqslant |f_n|_1 \leqslant ||f||_1 + 1.$$

Using inequality (2.1), we get

$$\int_{B_k} A(|\nabla u_n|)dx \leqslant ||f||_1 + 1. \tag{3.12}$$

Now let $p \in \big(1, \frac{N}{N-1}a_0\big)$ and consider the function $A_p(t) = A(t^{1/p})$. It is easy to verify that the function $a_p(t) = A'_p(t) = \frac{1}{p}t^{\frac{1}{p}-1}a(t^{1/p})$ satisfies the inequalities (1.5) with constants b_0, b_1, i.e.

$$b_0 \leqslant \frac{ta'_p(t)}{a_p(t)} \leqslant b_1 \qquad \forall t > 0, \quad \text{with} \quad b_0 = \frac{a_0 + 1 - p}{p}, \quad b_1 = \frac{a_1 + 1 - p}{p}.$$

Note that because $a_0 < N - 1$, we have $p < \frac{N}{N-1}a_0 = a_0 + \frac{1}{N-1}a_0 < a_0 + 1$. We also have $p < \frac{N}{N-1}a_0 < N$, since $a_0 < N - 1$.
Applying Hölder's inequality (see [1]), we obtain

$$\int_{B_k} |\nabla u_n|^p dx \leqslant 2\big||\nabla u_n|^p\big|_{L^{A_p}(B_k)} . \big|1\big|_{L^{\tilde{A}_p}(B_k)}. \tag{3.13}$$

From (3.12), we deduce that

$$\int_{B_k} A_p(|\nabla u_n|^p)dx = \int_{B_k} A(|\nabla u_n|)dx \leqslant ||f||_1 + 1. \tag{3.14}$$

Let $\lambda_* = \max\Big(\big((1+b_1)(1+||f||_1)\big)^{\frac{1}{1+b_0}}, \big((1+b_1)(1+||f||_1)\big)^{\frac{1}{1+b_1}}\Big)$. Using the inequality (2.4) for A_p and (3.14), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_k} A_p\big(\frac{|\nabla u_n|^p}{\lambda_*}\big)dx &\leqslant (1+b_1)\max\big(\frac{1}{\lambda_*^{1+b_0}}, \frac{1}{\lambda_*^{1+b_1}}\big)\int_{B_k} A_p(|\nabla u_n|^p)dx \\ &\leqslant (1+b_1)(1+||f||_1)\max\big(\frac{1}{\lambda_*^{1+b_0}}, \frac{1}{\lambda_*^{1+b_1}}\big) \leqslant 1.\end{aligned}$$

This leads to

$$\big||\nabla u_n|^p\big|_{L^{A_p}(B_k)} \leqslant \max\Big(\big((1+b_1)(1+||f||_1)\big)^{\frac{1}{1+b_0}}, \big((1+b_1)(1+||f||_1)\big)^{\frac{1}{1+b_1}}\Big). \tag{3.15}$$

Next we evaluate

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|1\big|_{L^{\widetilde{A}_p}(B_k)} &= \inf\big\{\lambda>0\ :\ \int_{B_k}\widetilde{A}_p(\frac{1}{\lambda})dx\leqslant 1\ \big\}\\
&= \inf\big\{\lambda>0\ :\ \widetilde{A}_p(\frac{1}{\lambda})\leqslant\frac{1}{|B_k|}\ \big\}\\
&= \frac{1}{\widetilde{A}_p^{-1}\big(\frac{1}{|B_k|}\big)}.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.16}$$

Taking into account (3.13), (3.15) and (3.16), we obtain

$$\int_{B_k}|\nabla u_n|^p dx\leqslant\frac{C_1}{\widetilde{A}_p^{-1}\big(\frac{1}{|B_k|}\big)}.$$

or

$$\frac{1}{|B_k|}\leqslant\widetilde{A}_p\Big(\frac{C_1}{\int_{B_k}|\nabla u_n|^p dx}\Big).\tag{3.17}$$

Let $p_*=\frac{pN}{N-p}$. Since $\lim_{k\to\infty}|B_k|=0$, we deduce from (3.17) that $\lim\limits_{k\to\infty}\displaystyle\int_{B_k}|\nabla u_n|^p dx=0$. It follows that there exists $k_0\geqslant 1$ such that

$$\int_{B_k}|\nabla u_n|^p dx\leqslant 1,\quad\forall k\geqslant k_0,\quad\forall n\geqslant 1.$$

Since $|B_k|\leqslant\dfrac{1}{k^{p_*}}\displaystyle\int_{B_k}|u_n|^{p_*}dx$, we obtain from (3.17) and the inequalities (2.5)-(2.6) applied to a_p, that for all $k\geqslant k_0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big(\frac{1}{k^{p_*}}\int_{B_k}|u_n|^{p_*}dx\Big)^{-1} &\leqslant\widetilde{A}_p\Big(\frac{C_1}{\int_{B_k}|\nabla u_n|^p dx}\Big)\\
&\leqslant\big(1+\frac{1}{b_0}\big)\max\bigg(\Big(\frac{1}{\int_{B_k}|\nabla u_n|^p dx}\Big)^{\frac{1}{b_0}+1},\Big(\frac{1}{\int_{B_k}|\nabla u_n|^p dx}\Big)^{\frac{1}{b_1}+1}\bigg)\widetilde{A}_p(C_1)\\
&\leqslant\big(1+\frac{1}{b_0}\big)\Big(\frac{1}{\int_{B_k}|\nabla u_n|^p dx}\Big)^{\frac{1}{b_0}+1}\widetilde{A}_p(C_1).
\end{aligned}$$

This leads for $C_2=\Big(\big(1+\dfrac{1}{b_0}\big)\widetilde{A}_p(C_1)\Big)^{\frac{b_0}{1+b_0}}$ to

$$\int_{B_k}|\nabla u_n|^p dx\leqslant C_2\frac{1}{k^{\frac{p_*b_0}{1+b_0}}}\Big(\int_{B_k}|u_n|^{p_*}dx\Big)^{\frac{b_0}{1+b_0}}.$$

Summing up over from $k=k_0$ to $k=K$ and using Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=k_0}^{K}\int_{B_k}|\nabla u_n|^p dx\quad\leqslant\quad C_2\Big(\sum_{k=k_0}^{K}\int_{B_k}|u_n|^{p_*}dx\Big)^{\frac{b_0}{1+b_0}}\Big(\sum_{k=k_0}^{K}\frac{1}{k^{p_*b_0}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{1+b_0}}.\tag{3.18}$$

Note that

$$\int_{\{|u_n|\leqslant K\}}|\nabla u_n|^p dx=\int_{D_{k_0}}|\nabla u_n|^p dx+\sum_{k=k_0}^{K}\int_{B_k}|\nabla u_n|^p dx. \tag{3.19}$$

To estimate the first integral in the right hand side of (3.19), we argue as above by using Hölder's inequality. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{D_{k_0}}|\nabla u_n|^p dx &\leqslant 2\big||\nabla u_n|^p\big|_{L^{A_p}(D_{k_0})}.\big|1\big|_{L^{\tilde{A}_p}(D_{k_0})}\leqslant 2\lambda_*.\frac{1}{\widetilde{A}_p^{-1}\big(\frac{1}{|D_{k_0}|}\big)}\\ &\leqslant 2\lambda_*.\frac{1}{\widetilde{A}_p^{-1}\big(\frac{1}{|\Omega|}\big)}=C_0. \end{aligned}\tag{3.20}$$

Note that the series $\displaystyle\sum_{k=k_0}^{K}\frac{1}{k^{p_*b_0}}$ converges since $a_0>\frac{N}{N-1}p$, and

$$p_*b_0=\frac{pN}{N-p}\frac{a_0+1-p}{p}=\frac{N}{N-p}(a_0+1-p)>\frac{N}{N-p}(\frac{N}{N-1}p+1-p)>1.$$

Combining (3.18)-(3.20), we get for k_0 large enough

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\{|u_n|\leqslant K\}}|\nabla u_n|^p dx &\leqslant C_0+C_2\Big(\int_{\{|u_n|\leqslant K\}}|u_n|^{p_*}dx\Big)^{\frac{b_0}{1+b_0}}\Bigg(\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{k^{p_*b_0}}\Bigg)^{\frac{1}{1+b_0}}\\ &= C_0+C_3\Big(\int_{\{|u_n|\leqslant K\}}|u_n|^{p_*}dx\Big)^{\frac{b_0}{1+b_0}}. \end{aligned}\tag{3.21}$$

Note that $T_K(u_n)\in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Indeed we have by Hölder's inequality

$$\int_\Omega|\nabla T_K(u_n)|^p dx\leqslant 2\big||\nabla T_K(u_n)|^p\big|_{L^{A_p}(\Omega)}.\big|1\big|_{L^{\tilde{A}_p}(\Omega)}=\frac{2}{\widetilde{A}_p^{-1}\big(\frac{1}{|\Omega|}\big)}.\big||\nabla T_K(u_n)|^p\big|_{L^{A_p}(\Omega)}.$$

and

$$\int_\Omega A_p(|\nabla T_K(u_n)|^p)dx=\int_\Omega A(|\nabla T_K(u_n)|)dx<\infty.$$

Similarly we verify that $T_K(g)=g\in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for $K>|g|_\infty$. Hence we have $T_K(u_n)-g\in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Using the Sobolev embedding $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)\subset L^{p_*}(\Omega)$, Poincaré's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|T_K(u_n)|^p_{L^{p_*}(\Omega)} &\leqslant 2^{p-1}\big(|T_K(u_n)-g|^p_{L^{p_*}(\Omega)}+|g|^p_{L^{p_*}(\Omega)}\big)\\ &\leqslant 2^{p-1}\big(C|\nabla(T_K(u_n)-g)|^p_{L^p(\Omega)}+|g|^p_{L^{p_*}(\Omega)}\big)\\ &\leqslant 2^{2(p-1)}C|\nabla T_K(u_n)|^p_{L^p(\Omega)}+2^{2(p-1)}C|\nabla g|^p_{L^p(\Omega)}+2^{p-1}|g|^p_{L^{p_*}(\Omega)}\\ &= C_4\Big(\int_{\{|u_n|\leqslant K\}}|\nabla u_n|^p dx+1\Big). \end{aligned}\tag{3.22}$$

Using the fact that

$$\int_{\{|u_n|\leqslant K\}} |u_n|^{p_*}dx \leqslant \int_{\{|u_n|\leqslant K\}} |T_K(u_n)|^{p_*}dx \leqslant |T_K(u_n)|^{p_*}_{L^{p_*}(\Omega)} \tag{3.23}$$

we obtain from (3.21)-(3.22), for $C_5 = C_3C_4^{\frac{p_*b_0}{p(1+b_0)}}$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\{|u_n|\leqslant K\}} |\nabla u_n|^p dx &\leqslant C_0 + C_3|T_K(u_n)|^{\frac{p_*b_0}{1+b_0}}_{L^{p_*}(\Omega)} \\ &\leqslant C_0 + C_5\Big(\int_{\{|u_n|\leqslant K\}} |\nabla u_n|^p dx + 1\Big)^{\frac{p_*b_0}{p(1+b_0)}}. \qquad (3.24)\end{aligned}$$

Now it is easy to verify that

$$\frac{p_*b_0}{p(1+b_0)} < 1 \;\Leftrightarrow\; a_0 + 1 < N.$$

It follows from (3.24) that for k_0 large enough, the integral $\int_{\{|u_n|\leqslant K\}} |\nabla u_n|^p dx$ is bounded independently of n and K. Using (3.22)-(3.23), we deduce that $\int_{\{|u_n|\leqslant K\}} |u_n|^{p_*}dx$ is also bounded independently of n and K. Letting $K \to \infty$, we deduce that $|\nabla u_n|_{L^p(\Omega)}$ and $|u_n|_{L^{p_*}(\Omega)}$ are uniformly bounded independently of n. In particular u_n is bounded in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Therefore there exists a subsequence of (u_n) and a function $v \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_n &\rightharpoonup v \quad \text{weakly in } W^{1,p}(\Omega) \\ u_n &\to v \quad \text{strongly in } L^p(\Omega) \text{ and a.e. in } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

But since $u_n \to u$ in measure in Ω, we have necessarily $u = v$ and $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

□

Lemma 3.5. *There exists a subsequence of* (u_n) *such that for each* $k > 0$

$$\lim_{n,m\to\infty} \int_{\{|u_n|\leqslant k, |u_m|\leqslant k\}} (\nabla_A u_n - \nabla_A u_m).\nabla(u_n - u_m)dx = 0.$$

Proof. We argue as in [5] for the proof of the uniqueness of the entropy solution. So let $n, m \geqslant 1$, $k > 0$ and $h \geqslant |g|_\infty, |\psi|_\infty$, with $k < h$. Let u_n and u_m be two entropy solutions of the obstacle problem associated with (f_n, ψ, g) and (f_m, ψ, g) respectively. It is easy to check that $T_h(u_m)$ and $T_h(u_n)$ are test functions for (1.9) associated with (f_n, ψ, g) and (f_m, ψ, g) respectively. We obtain for $t > 0$

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_A u_n.\nabla(T_t(u_n - T_h(u_m)))dx \leqslant \int_\Omega -f_nT_t(u_n - T_h(u_m))dx$$

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_A u_m.\nabla(T_t(u_m - T_h(u_n)))dx \leqslant \int_\Omega -f_m T_t(u_m - T_h(u_n))dx$$

Adding the two inequalities, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\{|u_n - T_h(u_m)|\leqslant t\}} \nabla_A u_n.\nabla(u_n - T_h(u_m))dx\\ &\quad + \int_{\{|u_m - T_h(u_n)|\leqslant t\}} \nabla_A u_m.\nabla(u_m - T_h(u_n))dx\\ &\quad \leqslant \int_\Omega -(f_n T_t(u_n - T_h(u_m)) + f_m T_t(u_m - T_h(u_n)))dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

Let us introduce the following sets as in [5]

$$\begin{aligned} C_0^h &= \{|u_n - u_m| \leqslant t,\ |u_n| \leqslant h,\ |u_m| \leqslant h\}\\ C_1^h &= \{|u_n - T_h(u_m)| \leqslant t,\ |u_m| > h\}\\ C_2^h &= \{|u_n - T_h(u_m)| \leqslant t,\ |u_m| \leqslant h,\ |u_n| > h\}\\ C_3^h &= \{|u_m - T_h(u_n)| \leqslant t,\ |u_n| > h\}\\ C_4^h &= \{|u_m - T_h(u_n)| \leqslant t,\ |u_n| \leqslant h,\ |u_m| > h\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then it is easy to see that $\{|u_n - T_h(u_m)| \leqslant t\} = C_0^h \cup C_1^h \cup C_2^h$ and $\{|u_m - T_h(u_n)| \leqslant t\} = C_0^h \cup C_3^h \cup C_4^h$. Moreover we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{C_0^h} \nabla_A u_n.\nabla(u_n - T_h(u_m))dx + \int_{C_0^h} \nabla_A u_m.\nabla(u_m - T_h(u_n))dx\\ &\qquad = \int_{C_0^h} (\nabla_A u_n - \nabla_A u_m).\nabla(u_n - u_m)dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{C_1^h} \nabla_A u_n.\nabla(u_n - T_h(u_m))dx = \int_{C_1^h} \nabla_A u_n.\nabla u_n dx \geqslant 0\\ &\int_{C_3^h} \nabla_A u_m.\nabla(u_m - T_h(u_n))dx = \int_{C_3^h} \nabla_A u_m.\nabla u_m dx \geqslant 0\\ &\int_{C_2^h} \nabla_A u_n.\nabla(u_n - T_h(u_m))dx = \int_{C_2^h} \nabla_A u_n.\nabla(u_n - u_m)dx \geqslant -\int_{C_2^h} \nabla_A u_n.\nabla u_m dx\\ &\int_{C_4^h} \nabla_A u_m.\nabla(u_m - T_h(u_n))dx = \int_{C_4^h} \nabla_A u_m.\nabla(u_m - u_n)dx \geqslant -\int_{C_4^h} \nabla_A u_m.\nabla u_n dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

We deduce from (3.25)-(3.27) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{C_0^h} (\nabla_A u_n - \nabla_A u_m).\nabla(u_n - u_m)dx \leqslant \int_\Omega -(f_n T_t(u_n - T_h(u_m)) + f_m T_t(u_m - T_h(u_n)))dx\\ &\qquad + \int_{C_2^h} |\nabla u_n| a(|\nabla u_m|)dx + \int_{C_4^h} |\nabla u_m| a(|\nabla u_n|)dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

Using inequality (2.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{C_2^h}|\nabla u_n|a(|\nabla u_m|)dx &\leqslant \int_{C_2^h}|\nabla u_n|a(|\nabla u_n|)dx+\int_{C_2^h}|\nabla u_m|a(|\nabla u_m|)dx\\ &\leqslant \int_{\{h<|u_n|\leqslant h+t\}}|\nabla u_n|a(|\nabla u_n|)dx+\int_{\{h-t<|u_m|\leqslant h\}}|\nabla u_m|a(|\nabla u_m|)dx. \quad (3.29)\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{C_4^h}|\nabla u_m|a(|\nabla u_n|)dx &\leqslant \int_{C_4^h}|\nabla u_n|a(|\nabla u_n|)dx+\int_{C_4^h}|\nabla u_m|a(|\nabla u_m|)dx\\ &\leqslant \int_{\{h<|u_m|\leqslant h+t\}}|\nabla u_m|a(|\nabla u_m|)dx+\int_{\{h-t<|u_n|\leqslant h\}}|\nabla u_n|a(|\nabla u_n|)dx. \quad (3.30)\end{aligned}$$

Now since $k<h$, we have $C_0^k \subset C_0^h$. Choosing $t=2k$, we obtain from (3.28), by using (2.7) and taking into account (3.29)-(3.30)

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\{|u_n|\leqslant k,|u_m|\leqslant k\}}(\nabla_A u_n-\nabla_A u_m).\nabla(u_n-u_m)dx\\ &\quad\leqslant \int_\Omega -(f_nT_t(u_n-T_h(u_m))+f_mT_t(u_m-T_h(u_n)))dx\\ &\quad+\int_{\{h<|u_n|\leqslant h+t\}}|\nabla u_n|a(|\nabla u_n|)dx+\int_{\{h-t<|u_n|\leqslant h\}}|\nabla u_n|a(|\nabla u_n|)dx\\ &\quad+\int_{\{h<|u_m|\leqslant h+t\}}|\nabla u_m|a(|\nabla u_m|)dx+\int_{\{h-t<|u_m|\leqslant h\}}|\nabla u_m|a(|\nabla u_m|)dx.\end{aligned}$$

Letting $h\to\infty$, and using Lemma 3.3 and Lebesgue's theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\{|u_n|\leqslant k,|u_m|\leqslant k\}}(\nabla_A u_n-\nabla_A u_m).\nabla(u_n-u_m)dx &\leqslant \int_\Omega -(f_n-f_m)T_t(u_n-u_m)dx\\ &\leqslant t|f_n-f_m|_1.\end{aligned}$$

We conclude by using the monotonicity inequality (2.7) and the convergence of (f_n) to f in $L^1(\Omega)$.

□

Proof of Proposition 3.1. We argue as in the proof of Lemma 3.2. So let s,k and ϵ be positive numbers. Then we have for every $n,m\geqslant 1$, $\{|\nabla u_n-\nabla u_m|>s\}\subset E_n^1\cup E_m^1\cup E_n^2\cup E_m^2\cup E_{m,n}$ where $E_n^1=\{|u_n|>k\}$, $E_n^2=\{|\nabla u_n|>k\}$ and $E_{n,m}=\{||\nabla u_n-\nabla u_m|>s,|u_n|\leqslant k,|u_m|\leqslant k,|\nabla u_n|\leqslant k,|\nabla u_m|\leqslant k\}$.

$$\mathcal{L}^N(\{|\nabla u_n-\nabla u_m|>s\})\leqslant \mathcal{L}^N(E_n^1)+\mathcal{L}^N(E_m^1)+\mathcal{L}^N(E_n^2)+\mathcal{L}^N(E_m^2)+\mathcal{L}^N(E_{m,n}). \quad (3.31)$$

Using the fact that by Lemma 3.4, the sequence (u_n) is uniformly bounded in $W^{1.p}(\Omega)$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}^N(E_n^1) \leqslant \frac{1}{k^p}\int_\Omega |u_n|^p dx \leqslant \frac{C}{k^p}.$$

$$\mathcal{L}^N(E_n^2) \leqslant \frac{1}{k^p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^p dx \leqslant \frac{C}{k^p}.$$

We deduce that there exists $k_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\forall k \geqslant k_\epsilon, \;\; \forall n, m \geqslant 1, \quad \mathcal{L}^N(E_n^1) + \mathcal{L}^N(E_m^1) + \mathcal{L}^N(E_n^2) + \mathcal{L}^N(E_m^2) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \tag{3.32}$$

Now using the inequality (2.7), we get for all $n, m \geqslant 1$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{E_{m,n}} |\nabla u_n - \nabla u_m|^2 \frac{a\big((|\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla u_m|^2)^{1/2}\big)}{(|\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla u_m|^2)^{1/2}} dx \\ &\leqslant \frac{1}{C(A,N)} \int_{E_{m,n}} \big(\nabla_A u_n - \nabla_A u_m\big).(\nabla u_n - \nabla u_m) dx \\ &\leqslant \frac{1}{C(A,N)} \int_{\{|u_n| \leqslant k, |u_m| \leqslant k\}} \big(\nabla_A u_n - \nabla_A u_m\big).(\nabla u_n - \nabla u_m) dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

Using the fact that we have in $E_{m,n}$

$$\begin{aligned} &s < |\nabla u_n - \nabla u_m| \leqslant |\nabla u_n| + |\nabla u_m| \leqslant \sqrt{2}(|\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla u_m|^2)^{1/2} \\ &(|\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla u_m|^2)^{1/2} \leqslant k\sqrt{2}, \end{aligned}$$

we deduce from (3.33)

$$\mathcal{L}^N(E_{m,n}) \leqslant \frac{k\sqrt{2}}{s^2 a(s/\sqrt{2}) C(A,N)} \int_{\{|u_n| \leqslant k, |u_m| \leqslant k\}} \big(\nabla_A u_n - \nabla_A u_m\big).(\nabla u_n - \nabla u_m) dx.$$

Using Lemma 3.5, for $k = k_\epsilon$, there exists $n_0 = n_0(s, k, \epsilon) \geqslant 1$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}^N(E_{m,n}) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \quad \forall n, m \geqslant n_0. \tag{3.34}$$

Combining (3.31), (3.32) and (3.34), we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}^N(\{|\nabla u_n - \nabla u_m| > s\}) < \epsilon \qquad \forall n, m \geqslant n_0.$$

We deduce that the sequence (∇u_n) is a Cauchy sequence in measure, and therefore there exists a measurable function V such that (∇u_n) converges in measure to the measurable

function V. We shall prove that $V = \nabla u$ and that (∇u_n) converges strongly to ∇u in $L^p(\Omega)$ for each $p \in \big(1, \frac{N}{N-1}a_0\big)$. To do that, we will apply Vitalli's Theorem, using the fact that by Lemma 3.4, ∇u_n is bounded in $L^p(\Omega)$ for each $p \in \big(1, \frac{N}{N-1}a_0\big)$.
So let $r \in \big(p, \frac{N}{N-1}a_0\big)$ and $O \subset \Omega$ be a measurable set. Then we have by Hölder's inequality

$$\int_O |\nabla u_n|^p dx \leqslant \Big(\int_O |\nabla u_n|^r dx\Big)^{p/r}.\big|O\big|^{\frac{r-p}{r}} \leqslant C\big|O\big|^{\frac{r-p}{r}} \to 0$$

uniformly in n, as $\big|O\big| \to 0$. We deduce that ∇u_n converges strongly to V in $L^p(\Omega)$. Using the fact that ∇u_n converges weakly to ∇u in $L^p(\Omega)$, we obtain $V = \nabla u$ and also that (∇u_n) converges strongly to ∇u in $L^p(\Omega)$ for each $p \in \big(1, \frac{N}{N-1}a_0\big)$.

Now assume that $a_1 < \frac{N}{N-1}a_0$ and let $p \in \big(a_1, \frac{N}{N-1}a_0\big)$. Note that since ∇u_n converges to ∇u a.e. in Ω, to prove the convergence

$$\nabla_A u_n \to \nabla_A u \quad \text{in } L^1(\Omega)$$

it suffices, Thanks to Vitalli's Theorem, to show that for every measurable subset O of Ω, $\displaystyle\int_O |\nabla_A u_n| dx$ converges to 0 uniformly in n, as $\big|O\big| \to 0$. Note that $|\nabla_A u_n| \leqslant a(|\nabla u_n|)$ and let $D(t) = (a^{-1}(t))^p$. The function $d(t) = \frac{(a^{-1}(t))^p}{t}$ satisfies the inequalities

$$d_0 \leqslant \frac{td'(t)}{d(t)} \leqslant d_1 \qquad \forall t > 0, \quad \text{with} \quad d_0 = \frac{p - a_1}{a_1}, \;\; d_1 = \frac{p - a_0}{a_0}.$$

It follows that we have by Hölder's inequality

$$\int_O a(|\nabla u_n|)dx \leqslant 2\big|a(|\nabla u_n|)\big|_{L^D(O)}.\big|1\big|_{L^{\widetilde{D}}(O)}.$$

Since we have also

$$\int_O D(a(|\nabla u_n|))dx = \int_O |\nabla u_n|^p dx \leqslant C,$$

and

$$\big|1\big|_{L^{\widetilde{D}}(O)} = \frac{1}{\widetilde{D}^{-1}\big(\frac{1}{|O|}\big)}$$

we obtain

$$\int_O a(|\nabla u_n|)dx \leqslant \frac{C}{\widetilde{D}^{-1}\big(\frac{1}{|O|}\big)} \to 0$$

uniformly in n, as $\big|O\big| \to 0$.

□

Lemma 3.6. *Let (v_n) be a sequence of measurable functions uniformly bounded in $L^{\widetilde{A}}(\Omega)$ and converging in measure to a measurable function v in Ω. Then (v_n) converges strongly to v in $L^1(\Omega)$.*

Proof. Let s, ϵ be two positive numbers. First note that we have for each measurable subset D of Ω (see the proof of Lemma 3.4) $|\chi_D|_{L^A(\Omega)} = \dfrac{1}{A^{-1}\big(\frac{1}{D}\big)}$. Next we have by Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
|v_n - v_m|_1 &\leqslant \int_{\{|v_n-v_m|\leqslant s\}} |v_n - v_m| dx + \int_{\{|v_n-v_m|>s\}} |v_n - v_m| dx \\
&\leqslant s|\Omega| + 2|v_n - v_m|_{L^{\tilde{A}}(\Omega)}.|\chi_{\{|v_n-v_m|>s\}}|_{L^A(\Omega)} \\
&\leqslant s|\Omega| + 4C.|\chi_{\{|v_n-v_m|>s\}}|_{L^A(\Omega)} \\
&\leqslant s|\Omega| + \frac{4C}{A^{-1}\big(\frac{1}{|v_n-v_m|>s\}}\big)} \qquad (3.35)
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $s = \frac{\epsilon}{2|\Omega|}$ and using the convergence in measure of (v_n) to v in Ω, we deduce that there exists $n_0 \geqslant 1$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}^N(\{|v_n - v_m| > s\}) < \frac{1}{A\big(\frac{8C}{\epsilon}\big)} \qquad \forall n, m \geqslant n_0. \qquad (3.36)$$

Combining (3.35) and (3.36), we obtain $|v_n - v_m|_1 < \epsilon$ for all $n, m \geqslant n_0$. Hence (v_n) is a Cauchy sequence in $L^1(\Omega)$, and therefore it converges in $L^1(\Omega)$. □

Lemma 3.7. *There exists a subsequence of* u_n *such that for all* $k > 0$

$$\nabla_A T_k(u_n) \quad \to \quad \nabla_A T_k(u) \quad \textit{strongly in } L^1(\Omega).$$

Proof. Let k be a positive number. First note that the sequence $(\nabla_A T_k(u_n))$ is uniformly bounded in $L^{\widetilde{A}}(\Omega)$. Indeed we have by the inequalities (2.1), (2.6), and Lemma 3.1

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega \widetilde{A}(|\nabla_A T_k(u_n)|) dx &\leqslant \int_\Omega \widetilde{A}(|a(|\nabla T_k(u_n))|) dx \\
&\leqslant \int_\Omega |\nabla T_k(u_n)| a(|\nabla T_k(u_n)|) dx \\
&\leqslant (1 + a_1) \int_\Omega A(|\nabla T_k(u_n)|) dx \\
&\leqslant C.
\end{aligned}$$

Next it is enough, thanks to Lemma 3.6, to show that there exists a subsequence of (u_n) such that

$$\nabla_A T_k(u_n) \quad \to \quad \nabla_A T_k(u) \quad \text{in measure in } \Omega. \qquad (3.37)$$

Let us first establish the following convergence

$$\nabla T_k(u_n) \quad \to \quad \nabla T_k(u) \quad \text{in measure in } \Omega. \qquad (3.38)$$

Let s be a positive number and set $F_n = \{|\nabla T_k(u_n) - \nabla T_k(u)| > s\}$. Note that we have $F_n \subset F_n^1 \cup F_n^2 \cup F_n^3$, with

$$\begin{aligned} F_n^1 &= \{|\nabla u_n - \nabla u| > s\} \cap \{|u_n| \leqslant k\} \cap \{|u| \leqslant k\} \\ F_n^2 &= \{|\nabla u| > s\} \cap \{|u_n| > k \geqslant |u|\} \\ F_n^3 &= \{|\nabla u_n| > s\} \cap \{|u| > k \geqslant |u_n|\}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account that (∇u_n) converges in measure to ∇u in Ω, and the fact that $F_n^1 \subset \{|\nabla u_n - \nabla u| > s\}$, we see that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{L}^N(F_n^1) = 0.$$

Since $u, u_n \in W^{1.p}(\Omega)$, we have $\nabla u = 0$ a.e. in $\{u = k\}$ and $\nabla u_n = 0$ a.e. in $\{u_n = k\}$. Therefore we have

$$\mathcal{L}^N(F_n^2) \leqslant \mathcal{L}^N(\{|u_n| > k > |u|\}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}^N(F_n^3) \leqslant \mathcal{L}^N(\{|u| > k > |u_n|\})$$

Using the a.e. convergence of (u_n) to u in Ω, we see that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{L}^N(\{|u_n| > k > |u|\}) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{L}^N(\{|u| > k > |u_n|\}) = 0.$$

This leads to $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{L}^N(F_n^2) = \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{L}^N(F_n^3) = 0$. Finally (3.38) follows, since we have $\mathcal{L}^N(F_n) \leqslant \mathcal{L}^N(F_n^1) + \mathcal{L}^N(F_n^2) + \mathcal{L}^N(F_n^3)$.
Let us now establish (3.37). So let s be a positive number and set

$$E_n = \{|\nabla_A T_k(u_n) - \nabla_A T_k(u)| > s\}.$$

Note that we have for each positive number t and each $n \geqslant 1$ $E_n \subset E_n^1 \cup E_n^2 \cup E_n^3$, with

$$\begin{aligned} &E_n^1 = \{|\nabla T_k(u_n)| > t\}, \quad E_n^2 = \{|\nabla T_k(u)| > t\} \\ &E_n^3 = E_n \cap \{|\nabla T_k(u_n)| \leqslant t\} \cap \{|\nabla T_k(u)| \leqslant t\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that by Lemma 3.4, the sequence (u_n) and the function u are uniformly bounded in $W^{1.p}(\Omega)$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}^N(E_n^1) \leqslant \frac{1}{t^p} \int_\Omega |\nabla T_k(u_n)|^p dx \leqslant \frac{1}{t^p} \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^p dx \leqslant \frac{C}{t^p}.$$

$$\mathcal{L}^N(E_n^2) \leqslant \frac{1}{t^p} \int_\Omega |\nabla T_k(u)|^p dx \leqslant \frac{1}{t^p} \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p dx \leqslant \frac{C}{t^p}.$$

We deduce that there exists $t_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\forall t \geqslant t_\epsilon, \quad \forall n \geqslant 1, \quad \mathcal{L}^N(E_n^1) + \mathcal{L}^N(E_n^2) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \tag{3.39}$$

Now we claim that there exists a positive constant $C(A,N)$ depending only on A and N such that we have the following inequality (see [11])

$$\Big|\frac{a(|\xi|)}{|\xi|}\xi - \frac{a(|\zeta|)}{|\zeta|}\zeta\Big| \leqslant C(A,N)|\xi-\zeta|\frac{a\big((|\xi|^2+|\zeta|^2)^{1/2}\big)}{(|\xi|^2+|\zeta|^2)^{1/2}} \ \forall \xi,\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N\setminus\{(0,0)\}. \quad (3.40)$$

Since

$$|\nabla_A T_k(u_n)-\nabla_A T_k(u)| \leqslant |a(\nabla T_k(u_n))|+|a(\nabla T_k(u))| \leqslant 2a\big((|\nabla T_k(u_n)|^2+|\nabla T_k(u)|^2)^{1/2}\big),$$

we deduce that we have in E_n^3

$$\begin{aligned} &s < 2a\big((|\nabla T_k(u_n)|^2 + |\nabla T_k(u)|^2)^{1/2}\big) \\ &(|\nabla T_k(u_n)|^2 + |\nabla T_k(u)|^2)^{1/2} \leqslant t\sqrt{2}, \end{aligned}$$

Applying the inequality (3.40), with $\xi = \nabla T_k(u_n)$ and $\zeta = \nabla T_k(u)$, we deduce that we have in E_n^3

$$\begin{aligned} s < |\nabla_A T_k(u_n) - \nabla_A T_k(u)| &\leqslant C|\nabla T_k(u_n) - \nabla T_k(u)|\frac{a\big((|\nabla T_k(u_n)|^2 + |\nabla T_k(u)|^2)^{1/2}\big)}{(|\nabla T_k(u_n)|^2 + |\nabla T_k(u)|^2)^{1/2}} \\ &\leqslant C|\nabla T_k(u_n) - \nabla T_k(u)|\frac{a(t\sqrt{2})}{a^{-1}(s/2)}, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$E_n^3 \subset \big\{|\nabla T_k(u_n) - \nabla T_k(u)| > \frac{sa^{-1}(s/2)}{Ca(t\sqrt{2})}\big\}.$$

Using the convergence in measure of $\nabla T_k(u_n)$ to $\nabla T_k(u)$, for $t = t_\epsilon$, we obtain the existence of $n_0 = n_0(s,\epsilon) \geqslant 1$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}^N(E_n^3) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \quad \forall n,m \geqslant n_0. \quad (3.41)$$

Combining (3.39) and (3.41), we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}^N(\{|\nabla_A T_k(u_n) - \nabla_A T_k(u)| > s\}) < \epsilon \quad \forall n \geqslant n_0.$$

Hence the sequence $(\nabla_A T_k(u_n))$ converges in measure to $\nabla_A T_k(u)$ and the Lemma follows.

$\square$

Lemma 3.8. *There exists a subsequence of u_n such that for all $k > 0$*

$$\begin{aligned} &\nabla_A T_k(u_n) \rightharpoonup \nabla_A T_k(u) \quad \textit{weakly in } L^{\widetilde{A}}(\{|u| < k\}) \\ &\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega \varphi\nabla_A T_k(u_n).\nabla(T_k(u_n))dx = \int_\Omega \varphi\nabla_A u.\nabla u dx \quad \forall\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\{|u| < k\}),\ \varphi \geqslant 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let us write

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \varphi\nabla_A T_k(u_n).\nabla(T_k(u_n))dx &= \int_\Omega \varphi\nabla_A T_k(u_n).\nabla(T_k(u))dx \\ &+ \int_\Omega \varphi\big(\nabla_A T_k(u_n) - \nabla_A T_k(u)\big).\nabla(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u))dx \\ &+ \int_\Omega \varphi\nabla_A T_k(u).\nabla(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u))dx \\ &= I_1^n + I_2^n + I_3^n. \end{aligned} \tag{3.42}$$

Since $\nabla_A T_k(u_n)$ is bounded in $L^{\widetilde{A}}(\Omega)$, there exists a subsequence of u_n and an element $\xi \in L^{\widetilde{A}}(\Omega)$ such that

$$\nabla_A T_k(u_n) \quad \rightharpoonup \quad \xi \quad \text{ weakly in } L^{\widetilde{A}}(\Omega). \tag{3.43}$$

From Lemma 3.2 and (3.43), we deduce that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} I_1^n = \int_\Omega \varphi\xi.\nabla T_k(u)dx. \tag{3.44}$$

For I_2^n, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2^n &= \int_{|u_n|\leqslant k,|u|\leqslant k} \varphi\big(\nabla_A u_n - \nabla_A u\big).\nabla(u_n - u)dx + \int_{|u|\leqslant k<|u_n|} \varphi\nabla_A u.\nabla u dx \\ &= I_{2,1}^n + I_{2,2}^n. \end{aligned} \tag{3.45}$$

Since $\chi_{|u|\leqslant k<|u_n|}$ converges a.e. to 0 in Ω, we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} I_{2,2}^n = 0. \tag{3.46}$$

Using (2.7), we obtain by Fatou's lemma and the last estimate in the proof of Lemma 3.5, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leqslant I_{2,1}^n &\leqslant \liminf_{m\to\infty} \int_{|u_n|\leqslant k,|u_m|\leqslant k} \varphi\big(\nabla_A u_n - \nabla_A u_m\big).\nabla(u_n - u_m)dx \\ &\leqslant ||\varphi||_\infty \liminf_{m\to\infty} \int_{|u_n|\leqslant k,|u_m|\leqslant k} \big(\nabla_A u_n - \nabla_A u_m\big).\nabla(u_n - u_m)dx \\ &\leqslant ||\varphi||_\infty \liminf_{m\to\infty} ||f_n - f_m||_1 = ||\varphi||_\infty ||f_n - f||_1. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \to \infty$, we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} I_{2,1}^n = 0. \tag{3.47}$$

Using (3.42)-(3.47), we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega \varphi\nabla_A T_k(u_n).\nabla(T_k(u_n))dx = \int_\Omega \varphi\xi.\nabla T_k(u)dx. \tag{3.48}$$

Using (2.7) and setting $\Theta(Y) = \frac{a(|\xi|)}{|\xi|}\xi$, we obtain for every vector function Y

$$\int_\Omega \varphi\big(\nabla_A T_k(u_n) - \Theta(Y)\big).(\nabla T_k(u_n) - Y)dx \geqslant 0.$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ and taking into account Lemma 3.2 and (3.48), we get

$$\int_\Omega \varphi\big(\xi - \Theta(Y)\big).(\nabla T_k(u) - Y)dx \geqslant 0.$$

Now choosing $Y = \nabla T_k(u) - \lambda\vartheta$, where λ is a positive number and ϑ is an arbitrary continuous vector function, we obtain

$$\int_\Omega \varphi\big(\xi - \Theta(\nabla T_k(u) - \lambda\vartheta)\big).\vartheta dx \geqslant 0.$$

Letting $\lambda \to 0$, we get

$$\int_\Omega \varphi\big(\xi - \nabla_A T_k(u)\big).\vartheta dx \geqslant 0.$$

Since ϑ is an arbitrary continuous vector function, it follows that $\xi = \nabla_A T_k(u)$. As a consequence, the Lemma follows from (3.43) and (3.48). □

4 Proofs of Theorems 1.1-1.6 and Corollaries 1.1-1.2

This section is devoted to the proofs of Theorems 1.1-1.6 and Corollaries 1.1-1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1.

Uniqueness of the Entropy Solution. Let u and v be two entropy solutions of the obstacle problem associated with (f, ψ, g). We argue as in the proof of Lemma 3.5, replacing u_n and u_m, respectively by u and v, and f_n, f_m by f. We get for $h \geqslant |g|_\infty, |\psi|_\infty$, $t = 2k$ and $0 < k < h$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\{|u|\leqslant k,|v|\leqslant k\}} \big(\nabla_A u - \nabla_A v\big).\nabla(u - v)dx \\
&\qquad\leqslant \int_\Omega -f(T_t(u - T_h(v)) + T_t(v - T_h(u)))dx \\
&\qquad+ \int_{\{h<|u|\leqslant h+t\}} |\nabla u|a(|\nabla u|)dx + \int_{\{h-t<|u|\leqslant h\}} |\nabla u|a(|\nabla u|)dx \\
&\qquad+ \int_{\{h<|v|\leqslant h+t\}} |\nabla v|a(|\nabla v|)dx + \int_{\{h-t<|v|\leqslant h\}} |\nabla v|a(|\nabla v|)dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $h \to \infty$, and using Lemma 3.3, we get

$$\int_{\{|u|\leqslant k, |v|\leqslant k\}} \big(\nabla_A u - \nabla_A v\big).\nabla(u-v)dx \leqslant 0.$$

Using (2.7), we obtain $\nabla u = \nabla v$ a.e. in $\{|u| \leqslant k, |v| \leqslant k\}$. Since this holds for all $k > 0$, we have $\nabla u = \nabla v$ a.e. in Ω. Therefore there exists a constant c such that $u = v + c$ a.e. in Ω. Using Poincaré's inequality for $T_k(u) - T_k(v) = T_k(u) - T_k(g) - (T_k(v) - T_k(g)) \in W_0^{1,A}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$, we obtain

$$\int_\Omega |T_k(u) - T_k(v)|dx \quad \leqslant \quad C\int_\Omega |\nabla T_k(u) - \nabla T_k(v)|dx$$

from which we deduce that

$$\int_{\{|u|\leqslant k, |v|\leqslant k\}} |u-v|dx \leqslant C\int_{\{|u|<k<|u|+|c|\}} |\nabla u|dx + C\int_{\{|u|-|c|<k<|u|\}} |\nabla u|dx.$$

Letting $k \to \infty$, we get

$$\int_\Omega |u-v|dx = 0.$$

It follows that $|u - v| = 0$ a.e. in Ω, which leads to $u = v$ a.e. in Ω.

Continuous Dependence. This is a consequence of Proposition 3.1.

Existence of an entropy solution. Let f_n be a sequence of smooth functions converging strongly to f in $L^1(\Omega)$, with $||f_n||_1 \leqslant ||f||_1 + 1$. We consider the sequence of approximated obstacle problems associated with (f_n, ψ, g). We know (see [25], [21]), that there exists a unique variational solution $u_n \in K_{\psi,g}$ of (1.7), which is also an entropy solution.

Let $v \in K_{\psi,g}$. Taking v as a test function for (1.9) associated to (f_n, ψ, g), we get

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_A u_n.\nabla(T_t(v-u_n))dx \geqslant \int_\Omega -f_n T_t(v-u_n)dx.$$

Since $\{|v - u_n| < t\} \subset \{|u_n| < s\}$, with $s = t + |v|_\infty$, the previous inequality can be written as

$$\int_\Omega \chi_n \nabla_A T_s(u_n).\nabla v dx \geqslant \int_\Omega -f_n T_t(v-u_n)dx + \int_\Omega \chi_n \nabla_A T_s(u_n).\nabla(T_s(u_n))dx, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\chi_n = \chi_{\{|v-u_n|<t\}}$. It is clear that $\chi_n \rightharpoonup \chi$ weakly$*$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. Moreover χ_n converges a.e. to $\chi_{\{|v-u|<t\}}$ in $\Omega \setminus \{|v-u| = t\}$. It follows that

$$\chi = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{in} \quad \{|v-u| < t\} \\ 0 & \text{in} \quad \{|v-u| > t\}. \end{cases}$$

Note that we have $\mathcal{L}^N(\{|v-u|=t\})=0$ for a.e. $t\in(0,\infty)$. So there exists a measurable set $\mathcal{N}\subset(0,\infty)$ such that $\mathcal{L}^N(\{|v-u|=t\})=0$ for all $t\in(0,\infty)\setminus\mathcal{N}$.

Assume that $t\in(0,\infty)\setminus\mathcal{N}$. Then χ_n converges weakly$*$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ and a.e. in Ω to $\chi=\chi_{\{|v-u|<t\}}$. Since $\nabla(T_s(u_n))$ converges a.e. to $\nabla(T_s(u))$ in Ω (Proposition 3.1), we obtain by Fatou's Lemma

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega \chi_n\nabla_A T_s(u_n).\nabla T_s(u_n)dx \geqslant \int_\Omega \chi\nabla_A T_s(u).\nabla T_s(u)dx. \tag{4.2}$$

Using the strong convergence of $\nabla_A T_s(u_n)$ to $\nabla_A T_s(u)$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ and the weak$*$ convergence of χ_n to χ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$, we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega \chi_n\nabla_A T_s(u_n).\nabla v dx = \int_\Omega \chi\nabla_A T_s(u).\nabla v dx. \tag{4.3}$$

Moreover since f_n converges to f in $L^1(\Omega)$ and $T_t(v-u_n)$ converges to $T_t(v-u)$ weakly$*$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$, we obtain by passing to the limit in (4.1) and taking into account (4.2)-(4.3)

$$\int_\Omega \chi\nabla_A T_s(u).\nabla v dx - \int_\Omega \chi\nabla_A T_s(u).\nabla(T_s(u))dx \geqslant \int_\Omega -fT_t(v-u)dx,$$

which can be written as

$$\int_{\{|v-u|\leqslant t\}} \chi\nabla_A T_s(u).(\nabla v-\nabla u)dx \geqslant \int_\Omega -fT_t(v-u)dx,$$

or since $\chi=\chi_{\{|v-u|<t\}}$ and $\nabla(T_t(v-u))=\chi_{\{|v-u|<t\}}\nabla(v-u)$

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_A u.\nabla(T_t(v-u))dx \geqslant \int_\Omega fT_t(v-u)dx \quad \forall t\in(0,\infty)\setminus\mathcal{N}.$$

For $t\in\mathcal{N}$, we know since $|\mathcal{N}|=0$, that there exists a sequence (t_k) of numbers in $(0,\infty)\setminus\mathcal{N}$ such that $t_k\longrightarrow t$. Therefore we have

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_A u.\nabla(T_{t_k}(v-u))dx \geqslant \int_\Omega -fT_{t_k}(v-u)dx \quad \forall k\geqslant 1. \tag{4.4}$$

Since $\nabla(v-u)=0$ a.e. in $\{|v-u|=t\}$, the left hand side of (4.4) can be written as

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_A u.\nabla(T_{t_k}(v-u))dx = \int_{\Omega\setminus|v-u|=t} \chi_{\{|v-u|<t_k\}}\nabla_A u.\nabla(v-u)dx.$$

The sequence $\chi_{\{|v-u|<t_k\}}$ converges to $\chi_{\{|v-u|<t\}}$ a.e. in $\Omega\setminus\{|v-u|=t\}$ and therefore converges weakly$*$ in $L^\infty(\Omega\setminus\{|v-u|=t\})$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_\Omega \nabla_A u.\nabla(T_{t_k}(v-u))dx &= \int_{\Omega\setminus\{|v-u|=t\}} \chi_{\{|v-u|<t\}}\nabla_A u.\nabla(v-u)dx\\ &= \int_\Omega \chi_{\{|v-u|<t\}}\nabla_A u.\nabla(v-u)dx\\ &= \int_\Omega \nabla_A u.\nabla(T_t(v-u))dx. \qquad (4.5)\end{aligned}$$

For the right hand side of (4.4), we have

$$\Big|\int_\Omega -fT_{t_k}(v-u)dx - \int_\Omega -fT_t(v-u)dx\Big| \leqslant |t_k - t|.|f|_1 \to\ 0 \text{ as } k\to\infty. \tag{4.6}$$

It follows from (4.4)-(4.6) that we have the inequality

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_A u.\nabla(T_t(v-u))dx \geqslant \int_\Omega -fT_t(v-u)dx \quad \forall t\in(0,\infty).$$

Hence u is an entropy solution of the obstacle problem associated with (f,ψ,g). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let f_n be a bounded sequence of smooth functions such that

$$f_n\ \to f \quad \text{in} \quad L^1(\Omega). \tag{4.7}$$

We consider the unique variational solution $u_n\in K_{\psi,g}$ of the obstacle problem associated with (f_n,ψ,g). From Proposition 2.1, we have

$$f_n - (f_n-\Delta_A\psi)^+ \leqslant \Delta_A u_n \leqslant f_n \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \Omega. \tag{4.8}$$

Let us first give a proof assuming that $a_1<\frac{N}{N-1}a_0$. We deduce from (4.8) that we have for every $\varphi\in\mathcal{D}(\Omega)$, $\varphi\geqslant 0$

$$\int_\Omega -f_n\varphi dx \leqslant \int_\Omega \nabla_A u_n.\nabla\varphi dx \leqslant \int_\Omega (-f_n+(f_n-\Delta_A\psi)^+)\varphi dx.$$

Using (4.7) and the strong convergence of $\nabla_A u_n$ to $\nabla_A u$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ (since $a_1<\frac{N}{N-1}a_0$, see Proposition 3.1), we get by letting $n\to\infty$

$$\int_\Omega -f\varphi dx \leqslant \int_\Omega \nabla_A u.\nabla\varphi dx \leqslant \int_\Omega (-f+(f-\Delta_A\psi)^+)\varphi dx.$$

Hence we obtain

$$f-(f-\Delta_A\psi)^+ \leqslant \Delta_A u\leqslant f \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \Omega.$$

Let us now deal with the general case. Choose $\epsilon>0$, $k>||\psi||_\infty$, and consider $H_\epsilon(t)$ the function introduced in the proof of Proposition 2.1. Let $\varphi\in\mathcal{D}(\{u<k\})$ with $\varphi\geqslant 0$. Denoting the functions $-f_n+(f_n-\Delta_A\psi)^+$ and $-f+(f-\Delta_A\psi)^+$ respectively by h_n and h, and multiplying (4.8) by $\varphi H_\epsilon(k+\epsilon-u_n)$ and integrating, we obtain

$$I_{n,k}+\int_\Omega -f_n\varphi H_\epsilon(k+\epsilon-u_n)dx \leqslant \int_\Omega H_\epsilon(k+\epsilon-u_n)\nabla_A(T_{k+\epsilon}(u_n)).\nabla\varphi dx \tag{4.9}$$

$$\int_\Omega H_\epsilon(k+\epsilon-u_n)\nabla_A(T_{k+\epsilon}(u_n)).\nabla\varphi dx \leqslant I_{n,k}+\int_\Omega h_n\varphi H_\epsilon(k+\epsilon-u_n)dx. \tag{4.10}$$

where

$$I_{n,k} \quad = \quad \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int_{\{k<u_n<k+\epsilon\}} \varphi\nabla_A u_n.\nabla u_n dx.$$

Since $u_n \geq \psi > -k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{n,k} &= \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int_{\{u_n<k+\epsilon\}} \varphi\nabla_A u_n.\nabla u_n dx - \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int_{\{u_n<k\}} \varphi\nabla_A u_n.\nabla u_n dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int_{\{|u_n|<k+\epsilon\}} \varphi\nabla_A u_n.\nabla u_n dx - \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int_{\{|u_n|<k\}} \varphi\nabla_A u_n.\nabla u_n dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int_{\Omega} \varphi\nabla_A (T_{k+\epsilon}(u_n)).\nabla T_{k+\epsilon}(u_n) dx - \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int_{\Omega} \varphi\nabla_A (T_k(u_n)).\nabla T_k(u_n) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \to \infty$, we obtain by using Lemma 3.8 and the fact that $supp(\varphi) \subset \{|u| < k\}$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} I_{n,k} = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int_{\Omega} \varphi\nabla_A (T_{k+\epsilon}(u)).\nabla T_{k+\epsilon}(u) dx - \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int_{\Omega} \varphi\nabla_A T_k(u).\nabla T_k(u) dx = 0.$$

Now letting $n \to \infty$ in (4.9)-(4.10), we obtain by using the results of Lemmas 3.2 and 3.8

$$\int_{\Omega} f\varphi H_\epsilon(k+\epsilon-u)dx \leqslant \int_{\Omega} H_\epsilon(k+\epsilon-u)\nabla_A(T_{k+\epsilon}(u)).\nabla\varphi dx \leqslant \int_{\Omega} h\varphi H_\epsilon(k+\epsilon-u)dx$$

which can be written since $supp(\varphi) \subset \{u < k\}$ and $k + \epsilon - u > \epsilon$ in $\{u < k\}$

$$\int_{\Omega} -f\varphi dx \leqslant \int_{\Omega} \nabla_A u.\nabla\varphi dx \leqslant \int_{\Omega} (-f + (f - \Delta_A\psi)^+ \varphi dx.$$

This means that

$$f - (f - \Delta_A\psi)^+ \leqslant \Delta_A u \leqslant f \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \{|u| < k\}, \quad \forall k > ||\psi||_\infty.$$

Hence we have proved that

$$f - (f - \Delta_A\psi)^+ \leqslant \Delta_A u \leqslant f \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \Omega.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let u_1, u_2 be two entropy solutions of the obstacle problem associated with (f_1, ψ, g) and (f_2, ψ, g). Let f_n^1, f_n^2 be two bounded sequences of smooth functions such that

$$f_n^i \to f^i \quad \text{in} \quad L^1(\Omega). \tag{4.11}$$

We consider the unique variational solutions $u_n^i \in K_{\psi,g}$ of the obstacle problem associated with (f_n^i, ψ, g). Let $\xi_n^i = \Delta_A u_n^i - f_n^i$, $i = 1, 2$. Then we have by Proposition 2.3

$$\int_\Omega |\xi_n^1 - \xi_n^2| dx \leqslant \int_\Omega |f_n^1 - f_n^2| dx. \tag{4.12}$$

Let $A_k = \{|u_1| < k\} \cap \{|u_2| < k\}$ and $A_k^n = \{|u_n^1| < k\} \cap \{|u_n^2| < k\}$. We deduce from (4.12) that

$$\int_{A_k^n \cap A_k} |\xi_n^1 - \xi_n^2| dx \leqslant \int_\Omega |f_n^1 - f_n^2| dx,$$

which can be written as

$$\int_{A_k} |\chi_{A_k^n} f_n^2 - \chi_{A_k^n} f_n^1 + \chi_{A_k^n}(\Delta_A u_n^2 - \Delta_A u_n^1)| dx \leqslant \int_\Omega |f_n^1 - f_n^2| dx. \tag{4.13}$$

Since $\chi_{A_k^n} \to 1$ a.e. in A_k, we have up to a subsequence

$$\chi_{A_k^n} \quad \to \quad 1 \quad \text{weakly-* in} \quad L^1(A_k). \tag{4.14}$$

Using (4.11) and (4.14), we obtain

$$\chi_{A_k^n} f_n^i \quad \to \quad f_i \quad \text{in} \quad L^1(A_k). \tag{4.15}$$

Now we have by Proposition 2.1, for any measurable subset A of Ω

$$\begin{aligned} \int_A |\chi_{A_k^n} \Delta_A u_n^i| dx &\leqslant ||f_n^i||_{L^1(A)} + ||\Delta_A \psi||_{L^1(A)} \\ &\leqslant ||f_n^i - f_i||_{L^1(A)} + ||f_i||_{L^1(A)} + ||\Delta_A \psi||_{L^1(A)}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the sequences $(\chi_{A_k^n} \Delta_A u_n^i)$ are bounded in $L^1(\Omega)$, and satisfy the assumptions of Dunford-Pettis Theorem. Therefore we have for a subsequence

$$\chi_{A_k^n} \Delta_A u_n^i \quad \rightharpoonup \quad \mathcal{U}_i \quad \text{in} \quad L^1(\Omega). \tag{4.16}$$

We shall prove that $\mathcal{U}_i = \Delta_A u_i$ a.e. in A_k. To do that, we will prove that $\chi_{A_k^n} \Delta_A u_n^i$ converges to $\Delta_A u_i$ in $\mathcal{D}'(A_k)$. Indeed we have for $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(A_k)$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A_k} \chi_{A_k^n} \Delta_A u_n^i \varphi dx &= \int_{A_k \cap A_k^n} \Delta_A u_n^i \varphi dx \\ &= -\int_{A_k \cap A_k^n} \nabla_A u_n^i . \nabla \varphi dx \\ &= -\int_{A_k} \chi_{A_k^n} \nabla_A (T_k(u_n^i)). \nabla \varphi dx. \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

Using (4.14) and Lemma 3.7, and passing to the limit in (4.17), we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{A_k} \chi_{A_k^n} \Delta_A u_n^i \varphi dx = -\int_{A_k} \nabla_A (T_k(u_i)). \nabla \varphi dx = \int_{A_k} \Delta_A u_i \varphi dx. \tag{4.18}$$

We deduce from (4.16) and (4.18) that we have $\mathcal{U}_i = \Delta_A u_i$ a.e. in A_k.

It follows from (4.14) and (4.18) that $\chi_{A_k^n} f_n^2 - \chi_{A_k^n} f_n^1 + \chi_{A_k^n}(\Delta_A(T_k(u_n^2)) - \Delta_A(T_k(u_n^1)))$ converges weakly to $f_2 - f_1 + (\Delta_A(T_k(u_2)) - \Delta_A(T_k(u_1)))$ in $L^1(A_k)$. Using the semi-continuity of the norm $||.||_{L^1(A_k)}$, (4.11) and the fact that $f_2 - f_1 + (\Delta_A(T_k(u_2)) - \Delta_A(T_k(u_1))) = f_2 - f_1 + \Delta_A u_2 - \Delta_A u_1 = \xi_1 - \xi_2$ in A_k, we get from (4.13)

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{A_k} |\xi_1 - \xi_2| dx &\leqslant \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_{A_k} |\chi_{A_k^n} f_n^2 - \chi_{A_k^n} f_n^1 + (\Delta_A(T_k(u_n^2)) - \Delta_A(T_k(u_n^1)))| dx \\
&\leqslant \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega |f_n^1 - f_n^2| dx \\
&= \int_\Omega |f_1 - f_2| dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Since k is arbitrary, we get

$$\int_\Omega |\xi_1 - \xi_2| dx \leqslant \int_\Omega |f_1 - f_2| dx.$$

$\square$

Proof of Corollary 1.1. Let f_n be a sequence of bounded smooth functions such that

$$f_n \to f \quad \text{in} \quad L^1(\Omega). \tag{4.19}$$

From Propositions 2.1 and 2.2, we have for a function $0 \leqslant q_n \leqslant \chi_n = \chi_{\{u_n = \psi\}}$

$$\Delta_A u_n - (\Delta_A \psi - f_n) q_n = f_n \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega. \tag{4.20}$$

Since $0 \leqslant \chi_n \leqslant 1$, there exists a subsequence of χ_n and a function $\chi \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that

$$\chi_n \rightharpoonup \chi_* \quad \text{weakly* in } L^\infty(\Omega). \tag{4.21}$$

Similarly, there exists a subsequence of q_n and a function $q \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that

$$q_n \rightharpoonup q \quad \text{weakly* in } L^\infty(\Omega). \tag{4.22}$$

Using (4.16) and (4.19) and arguing as in the proof of Theorem 1.2, we obtain by passing to the limit in (4.17) that

$$\Delta_A u - (\Delta_A \psi - f) q = f \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega. \tag{4.23}$$

We are going to prove that $\chi = \chi_{\{u=\psi\}}$. Since $q_n \leqslant \chi_n$, we get $q \leqslant \chi_*$ a.e. in Ω. Passing to the limit in $\int_\Omega (u_n - \psi)\chi_n dx = 0$, we get $\int_\Omega (u - \psi)\chi_* dx = 0$. Since $0 \leqslant \chi_* \leqslant 1$, we obtain $\chi_* = 0$ a.e. in $\{u > \psi\}$. Hence $q \leqslant \chi_* \leqslant \chi$ a.e. in Ω.

Since u satisfies (1.13), we get $(\Delta_A\psi - f)^+ q = (\Delta_A\psi - f)^+\chi$, a.e. in Ω, which can be written as $(\Delta_A\psi - f)(\chi - q)$ a.e. in Ω. Because $\Delta_A\psi \neq f$ a.e. in Ω, we deduce that we have $q = \chi = \chi_{\{u=\psi\}}$ a.e. in Ω. Hence (4.18) becomes

$$\chi_{\{u_n=\psi\}} \rightharpoonup \chi_{\{u=\psi\}} \quad \text{weakly* in } L^\infty(\Omega).$$

Since χ_n and χ are characteristic functions, we obtain

$$\chi_{\{u_n=\psi\}} \to \chi_{\{u=\psi\}} \quad \text{in } L^s(\Omega) \ \ \forall s < \infty.$$

□

Proof of Corollary 1.2. Let u_1, u_2 be two entropy solutions of the obstacle problem associated with (f_1, ψ, g) and (f_2, ψ, g) and satisfying (1.13). Let ω be a measurable subset of Ω such that we have, for some $\lambda > 0$, $\Delta_A\psi - f_i \leqslant -\lambda$, a.e. in ω, $i = 1, 2$. Then we have by (1.13)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}^N\big((I_1 \div I_2) \cap \omega\big) &= \int_\omega \chi_{I_1 \div I_2} dx = \int_\omega |\chi_{I_1} - \chi_{I_2}| dx \\
&= \int_\omega |\chi_{\{u=\psi_1\}} - \chi_{\{u=\psi_2\}}| dx \\
&\leqslant \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_\omega |(\Delta_A\psi - f_1)\chi_{\{u=\psi_1\}} - (\Delta_A\psi - f_2)\chi_{\{u=\psi_2\}}| dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_\omega |(\Delta_A u_1 - f_1) - (\Delta_A u_2 - f_2)| dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_\omega |\xi_1 - \xi_2| dx \\
&\leqslant \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_\Omega |f_1 - f_2| dx.
\end{aligned}$$

□

5 Growth of the Gradient near the Free Boundary

In all what follows, we assume that the obstacle $\psi \equiv 0$ and without loss of generality, we assume that $x_0 = 0$ and $\omega_0 = B_1 = \{x \ : \ ||x|| < 1 \}$.

Moreover due to the local character of the results of the coming sections, we will restrict ourselves to the unit ball and will consider the solutions of the following class of problems

$$\mathcal{F}_A : \begin{cases} u \in W^{1,A}(B_1) \cap C^{1,\alpha}_{loc}(B_1) \\ \Delta_A u = f \quad \text{in} \quad \{u > 0\} \cap B_1, \\ 0 \leqslant u \leqslant M_0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_1, \\ 0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}, \end{cases}$$

where M_0 is a positive number. We may also assume that there exists a positive constant $M_1 = M_1(a_0, a_1, N, a(1), M_0, \Lambda_0)$ such that

$$|u|_{1,\alpha,\overline{B}_{3/4}} \leqslant M_1 \qquad \forall u \in \mathcal{F}_A. \tag{5.1}$$

The following theorems give the growth of the elements of the family $\mathcal{F}_A$ and their gradients near the free boundary. The first one was proved in [8] by contradiction. We provide here a direct proof.

Proposition 5.1. *There exists a positive constant* $C_0 = C_0(a_0, a_1, N, M_0, \Lambda_0)$ *such that for every* $u \in \mathcal{F}_A$*, we have*

$$0 \leqslant u(x) \leqslant C_0 \widetilde{A}(|x|) \qquad \forall x \in B_1$$

where $\widetilde{A}$ *is the function defined by (1.21).*

Proof. Let $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and set $\omega_k(x) = \dfrac{u(2^{-k}x)}{2^{-k}}$ for $x \in B_1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta_A \omega_k(x) = 2^{-k}(\Delta_A u)(2^{-k}x), \qquad \|\Delta_A \omega_k\|_\infty \leqslant 2^{-k}\Lambda_0 \\ &0 \leqslant \omega_k \leqslant \frac{M_0}{2^{-k}} \quad \text{ in } B_1, \qquad \inf_{B_{1/2}} \omega_k = 0. \end{aligned}$$

By Harnack's inequality (see Corollary 1.4 [13]), we have for some constant $C = C(a_0, a_1, N, M_0)$,

$$\sup_{B_{1/2}} \omega_k \leqslant C\big(\inf_{B_{1/2}} \omega_k + a^{-1}(2^{-k}\Lambda_0)\big) = Ca^{-1}(2^{-k}\Lambda_0).$$

We deduce from (2.5)-(2.6) that

$$\sup_{B_{2^{-k-1}}} u = 2^{-k} \sup_{B_{1/2}} \omega_k \leqslant 2C 2^{-k-1} a^{-1}(2^{-k-1} 2\Lambda_0) \leqslant C' \widetilde{A}(2^{-k-1})$$

where $C' = 2C\big(1 + \frac{1}{a_0}\big) \max\big((2\Lambda_0)^{\frac{1}{a_0}}, (2\Lambda_0)^{\frac{1}{a_1}}\big)$.
Now, let $x \in B_{1/2}$ and set $r = |x|$. Then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that $2^{-k-2} \leqslant r < 2^{-k-1}$ and we have by (2.5)-(2.6)

$$u(x) \leqslant \sup_{B_{2^{-k-1}}} u \leqslant C' \widetilde{A}(2^{-k-1}) \leqslant C' \widetilde{A}(2r) \leqslant C'.2^{(1+\frac{1}{a_0})} \widetilde{A}(r) = 2^{(1+\frac{1}{a_0})} C' \widetilde{A}(|x|).$$

If $x \in B_1 \setminus B_{1/2}$, we have

$$u(x) \leqslant M_0 = \frac{M_0}{\widetilde{A}(|x|)} \widetilde{A}(|x|) \leqslant \frac{M_0}{\widetilde{A}(2^{-1})} \widetilde{A}(|x|).$$

□

Proposition 5.2. *There exists a positive constant* $C_1 = C_1(a_0, a_1, a(1), N, M_0, M_1, \Lambda_0)$ *such that for every* $u \in \mathcal{F}_A$*, we have*

$$|\nabla u(x)| \leqslant C_1 a^{-1}(|x|) \qquad \forall x \in B_{3/4}. \tag{5.2}$$

In order to prove Proposition 5.2, we need to introduce some notations. For a nonnegative bounded function u, we define the quantity

$$S(r, u) = \sup_{x \in B_r(0)} u(x).$$

We also define for $u \in \mathcal{F}_A$ the set

$$\mathbb{P}(u) = \{j \in \mathbb{N} / \quad 2^{\frac{1}{a_0}} S(2^{-j-1}, |\nabla u|) \geqslant S(2^{-j}, |\nabla u|)\}.$$

Then we have

Lemma 5.1. *Assume that* $\mathbb{P}(u) \neq \emptyset$*. Then, there exists a constant* $c_1 = c_1(a_0, a_1, a(1), N, M_0, M_1, \Lambda_0)$ *such that*

$$S(2^{-j-1}, |\nabla u|) \leqslant c_1 a^{-1}(2^{-j}) \qquad \forall u \in \mathcal{F}_A, \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{P}(u).$$

Proof. We argue by contradiction. So we assume that

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \exists u_k \in \mathcal{F}_A, \quad \exists j_k \in \mathbb{P}(u_k) \quad \text{such that} \quad S(2^{-j_k-1}, |\nabla u_k|) \geqslant k a^{-1}(2^{-j_k}).$$

Consider $w_k(x) = \dfrac{u_k(2^{-j_k}x)}{2^{-j_k}}$ for $x \in B_1$. We have $\nabla w_k(x) = \nabla u_k(2^{-j_k}x)$ and by Proposition 5.1

$$\Delta_A w_k(x) = 2^{-j_k}(\Delta_A u_k)(2^{-j_k}x), \qquad \|\Delta_A w_k\|_\infty \leqslant 2^{-j_k}\Lambda_0$$
$$0 \leqslant w_k \leqslant C_0 \frac{\widetilde{A}(2^{-j_k})}{2^{-j_k}} \quad \text{in } B_1, \qquad w_k(0) = 0.$$

Now let $v_k(x) = \dfrac{w_k(x)}{S(2^{-j_k-1}, |\nabla u_k|)} = \dfrac{u_k(2^{-j_k}x)}{2^{-j_k} S(2^{-j_k-1}, |\nabla u_k|)} = \dfrac{u_k(2^{-j_k}x)}{m_k}$ for $x \in B_1$.
We introduce the functions

$$b_k(t) = \frac{a(t m_k)}{a(m_k)}, \qquad B_k(t) = \int_0^t b_k(\tau) d\tau = \frac{A(m_k t)}{m_k a(m_k)}.$$

Then it is easy to see that v_k satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\Delta_{B_k} v_k\|_\infty = \|\Delta_A w_k\|_\infty \leqslant 2^{-j_k}\Lambda_0\\
&0 \leqslant v_k \leqslant \frac{C_0\widetilde{A}(2^{-j_k})}{2^{-j_k}S(2^{-j_k-1},u_k)} \leqslant \frac{C_0\widetilde{A}(2^{-j_k})}{2^{-j_k}ka^{-1}(2^{-j_k})} \leqslant \frac{C_0}{k} \quad \text{in } B_1 \quad \text{by (2.6)}\\
&\sup_{B_{1/2}} |\nabla v_k| = 1\\
&v_k(0) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Since b_k satisfies (1.5) with the same constants a_0 and a_1, we have $v_k \in C^{1,\alpha}_{loc}(B_1)$ with

$$|v_k|_{1,\alpha,B_{3/4}} \leqslant C(a_0, a_1, a(1), N, C_0, \Lambda_0).$$

Hence up to a subsequence, we have $v \to v_k$ in $C^{1,\beta}(\overline{B_{3/4}})$, for all $\beta \in (0,\alpha)$. We deduce that $\sup_{B_{1/2}} |\nabla v_k| \to \sup_{B_{1/2}} |\nabla v|$. Therefore we have $\sup_{B_{1/2}} |\nabla v| = 1$. But this contradicts the fact that

$$0 \leqslant v(x) = lim_{k\to\infty} v_k(x) \leqslant lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{C}{k} = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in B_1.$$

□

Proof of Proposition 5.2.
Let $S(3/4, |\nabla u|) = M_1 = C(a_0, a_1, a(1), N, M_0, \Lambda_0)$. First, we prove by induction that we have for $c_2 = \max(\frac{M_1}{a^{-1}(1/2)}, c_1 2^{\frac{1}{a_0}})$

$$S(2^{-j}, |\nabla u|) \leqslant c_2 a^{-1}(2^{-j}) \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{F}_A.$$

Let $u \in \mathcal{F}_A$. For $j = 1$, we have

$$S(2^{-1}, |\nabla u|) = S(1/2, |\nabla u|) \leqslant M_1 = \frac{M_1}{a^{-1}(1/2)}a^{-1}(1/2) \leqslant c_2 a^{-1}(2^{-1}).$$

Let $j \geqslant 1$ and assume that $S(2^{-j}, u) \leqslant c_2 a^{-1}(2^{-j})$. We distinguish two cases :

– If $j \in \mathbb{P}(u)$, we have by Lemma 5.1 and (2.5),

$$S(2^{-j-1}, |\nabla u|) \leqslant c_1 a^{-1}(2^{-j}) = c_1 a^{-1}(2.2^{-j-1}) \leqslant c_1 2^{\frac{1}{a_0}} a^{-1}(2^{-j-1}) \leqslant c_2 a^{-1}(2^{-j-1}).$$

– If $j \notin \mathbb{P}(u)$, we have $S(2^{-j-1}, |\nabla u|) < \frac{S(2^{-j},u)}{2^{\frac{1}{a_0}}}$. Using the induction assumption and (2.5), we get

$$S(2^{-j-1}, |\nabla u|) \leqslant \frac{c_2}{2^{\frac{1}{a_0}}} a^{-1}(2^{-j}) \leqslant \frac{c_2}{2^{\frac{1}{a_0}}} 2^{\frac{1}{a_0}} a^{-1}(2^{-j-1}) = c_2 a^{-1}(2^{-j-1}).$$

Now, let $x \in B_{1/2}$ and set $r = |x|$. Then there exists $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^{-j-1} \leqslant r \leqslant 2^{-j}$ and we have for $C_1 = \max(\frac{M_1}{a^{-1}(1/2)}, c_2 2^{\frac{1}{a_0}})$

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla u(x)| &\leqslant \sup_{y \in \overline{B_{2^{-j}}}} |\nabla u(y)| = S(2^{-j}, |\nabla u|) \leqslant c_2 a^{-1}(2^{-j}) \\ &\leqslant c_2 a^{-1}(2r) \leqslant c_2 2^{\frac{1}{a_0}} a^{-1}(r) \leqslant C_1 a^{-1}(|x|). \end{aligned}$$

If $x \in B_{3/4} \setminus B_{1/2}$, we have

$$|\nabla u(x)| \leqslant M_1 = \frac{M_1}{a^{-1}(|x|)} a^{-1}(|x|) \leqslant \frac{M_1}{a^{-1}(2^{-1})} a^{-1}(|x|) \leqslant C_1 a^{-1}(|x|).$$

$\square$

6 Hausdorff Measure Estimate of the Free Boundary

We shall start by establishing local L^2-estimate for the second derivatives of u. In order to do that, we define for each $r > 0$ and each function $u \in \mathcal{F}_A$, the quantity

$$\begin{aligned} E(r,u) &= \frac{1}{|B_r|} \int_{B_r \cap \{\nabla u(x) \neq 0\}} \Big[\frac{a(|\nabla u|}{|\nabla u|} |D^2 u|\Big]^2 dx \\ &= \frac{1}{|B_1|} \int_{B_1 \cap \{\nabla u(rx) \neq 0\}} \Big[\frac{a(|\nabla u(rx)|}{|\nabla u(rx)|} D^2 u(rx)|\Big]^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

We also introduce for each $\epsilon \in (0,1)$, the unique solution of the problem

$$(P_\epsilon) \begin{cases} u_\epsilon - u \in W_0^{1,A}(B_1) \\ \Delta_{A_\epsilon} u_\epsilon = f H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) \quad \text{in} \quad B_1, \end{cases}$$

where A_ϵ is the function defined in Section 2.

Lemma 6.1. *Under the assumptions (1.24)-(1.25), there exists two positive constants $C_2 = C_2(a_0, a_1, N, t_*, M_1)$ and $C_3 = C_3(a_0, N, t_*, M_1)$ such that we have for every $u \in \mathcal{F}_A$*

$$E(1/2, u) \leqslant C_2 a^2(||\nabla u||_{B_{3/4},\infty}) + C_3 a(||\nabla u||_{B_{3/4},\infty}) \int_{B_{3/4}} |\nabla f| dx. \tag{6.1}$$

Proof. Let $u \in \mathcal{F}_A$ and consider for each $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ the unique solution of the problem (P_ϵ). Note that $u_\epsilon \to u$ in $W^{1,A}(B_1)$ and that $u_\epsilon \in W^{2,2}_{loc}(B_1)$ (see [10]). Moreover we have by taking φ_{x_i} as a test function for (P_ϵ) and integrating by parts, where $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(B_1)$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_1}\nabla_{A_\epsilon}u_\epsilon.(\nabla\varphi_{x_i})dx &= -\int_{B_1} fH_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)\varphi_{x_i}dx\\ \int_{B_1}(\nabla_{A_\epsilon}u_\epsilon)_{x_i}.\nabla\varphi dx &= \int_{B_1} fH_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)\varphi_{x_i}dx. \qquad (6.2)\end{aligned}$$

By density (6.2) remains valid for $\varphi = G(u_{\epsilon x_i})\zeta^2$, where $G(t)$ is smooth enough and $\zeta \in \mathcal{D}(B_{3/4})$ such that

$$\begin{cases} 0 \leqslant \zeta \leqslant 1 \quad \text{in } B_{3/4}\\ \zeta = 1 \quad \text{in } B_{1/2}\\ |\nabla\zeta| \leqslant 4 \quad \text{in } B_{3/4}.\end{cases}$$

Setting $t_\epsilon = (\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}$, the left hand side of (6.2) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} I^i &= \int_{B_1}\Big(\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}\nabla u_\epsilon\Big)_{x_i}.\nabla(G(u_{\epsilon x_i})\zeta^2)dx\\ &= \int_{B_1}\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}\Big[\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i} + \Big(\frac{a'(t_\epsilon)}{a(t_\epsilon)}t_\epsilon - 1\Big)\frac{\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}.\nabla u_\epsilon}{\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2}\nabla u_\epsilon\Big].\big[\zeta^2 G'(u_{\epsilon x_i})\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i} + 2\zeta G(u_{\epsilon x_i})\nabla\zeta\big]\\ &= \int_{B_1}\zeta^2 G'(u_{\epsilon x_i})\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}\Big[|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2 + \Big(\frac{a'(t_\epsilon)}{a(t_\epsilon)}t_\epsilon - 1\Big)\frac{|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}.\nabla u_\epsilon|^2}{\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2}\Big]dx\\ &+ \int_{B_1} 2\zeta G(u_{\epsilon x_i})\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}\nabla\zeta\Big[\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i} + \Big(\frac{a'(t_\epsilon)}{a(t_\epsilon)}t_\epsilon - 1\Big)\frac{\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}.\nabla u_\epsilon}{\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2}\nabla u_\epsilon\Big]dx\\ &= I_1^i + I_2^i. \qquad (6.3)\end{aligned}$$

According to the assumption (1.25), we shall discuss two cases:

1^{st} *Case* : $t \to \frac{a(t)}{t}$ is non-increasing in $(0, t_*)$

Let $G(t) = \dfrac{a((\epsilon+t^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon+t^2)^{1/2}}t$. Then we have since $a_0 \leqslant 1$

$$\begin{aligned} G'(t) &= \frac{a((\epsilon+t^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon+t^2)^{1/2}}\Big[1 + \Big(\frac{a'((\epsilon+t^2)^{1/2})}{a((\epsilon+t^2)^{1/2})}(\epsilon+t^2)^{1/2} - 1\Big)\frac{t^2}{\epsilon+t^2}\Big]\\ &\geqslant a_0\frac{a((\epsilon+t^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon+t^2)^{1/2}}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $s_\epsilon = (\epsilon + |u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2)^{1/2}$. Using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (1.5), we get

$$I_1^i \geqslant a_0^2\int_{B_1}\zeta^2\frac{a(s_\epsilon)}{s_\epsilon}\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2 dx. \qquad (6.4)$$

For I_2^i, we have by Young's inequality, since $|\nabla\zeta| \leqslant 4$

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_2^i| &\leqslant \int_{B_1} 8(2+a_1)\zeta \frac{a(s_\epsilon)}{s_\epsilon}\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|u_{\epsilon x_i}||\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|dx \\
&\leqslant \frac{a_0^2}{2}\int_{B_1}\zeta^2\frac{a(s_\epsilon)}{s_\epsilon}\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2dx \\
&\quad +\frac{32(2+a_1)^2}{a_0^2}\int_{B_{3/4}}\frac{a(s_\epsilon)}{s_\epsilon}\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2dx \\
&\leqslant \frac{a_0^2}{2}\int_{B_1}\zeta^2\frac{a(s_\epsilon)}{s_\epsilon}\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2dx \\
&\quad +\frac{32(2+a_1)^2}{a_0^2}\int_{B_{3/4}}(a(t_\epsilon))^2dx. \qquad (6.5)
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, integrating by parts and using the monotonicity of H_ϵ, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I^i &= \int_{B_1} fH_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)(G(u_{\epsilon x_i})\zeta^2)_{x_i}dx \\
&= -\int_{B_1} fH'_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)u_{\epsilon x_i}G(u_{\epsilon x_i})\zeta^2dx - \int_{B_1} f_{x_i}H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)G(u_{\epsilon x_i})\zeta^2dx \\
&\leqslant -\int_{B_1} f_{x_i}H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)G(u_{\epsilon x_i})\zeta^2dx. \qquad (6.6)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we get from (6.2)-(6.5) that

$$\int_{B_1}\zeta^2\frac{a(s_\epsilon)}{s_\epsilon}\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2dx \leqslant \frac{64(2+a_1)^2}{a_0^4}\int_{B_{3/4}}(a(t_\epsilon))^2dx + \frac{2}{a_0^2}\int_{B_{3/4}}|\nabla f|a(t_\epsilon)dx. \qquad (6.7)$$

Note that we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B_{1/2}}\Big[\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|\Big]^2dx = \int_{B_{1/2}\cap\{s_\epsilon\leqslant t_\epsilon<t_*\}}\Big[\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|\Big]^2dx \\
&+\int_{B_{1/2}\cap\{s_\epsilon<t_*\leqslant t_\epsilon\}}\Big[\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|\Big]^2dx + \int_{B_{1/2}\cap\{t_*\leqslant s_\epsilon<\leqslant t_\epsilon\}}\Big[\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|\Big]^2dx. \qquad (6.8)
\end{aligned}$$

Using the monotonicity of $\frac{a(t)}{t}$ in $(0,t_*)$, and the uniform boundness of $||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty}$, we get

$$\int_{B_{1/2}\cap\{s_\epsilon\leqslant t_\epsilon<t_*\}}\Big[\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|\Big]^2dx \leqslant \int_{B_{1/2}\cap\{s_\epsilon\leqslant t_\epsilon<t_*\}}\frac{a(s_\epsilon)}{s_\epsilon}\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2dx. \qquad (6.9)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_{1/2}\cap\{s_\epsilon<t_*\leqslant t_\epsilon\}}\Big[\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|\Big]^2dx &= \frac{t_*}{a(t_*)}\int_{B_{1/2}\cap\{s_\epsilon<t_*\leqslant t_\epsilon\}}\frac{a(t_*)}{t_*}\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2dx\\ &\leqslant \frac{a(||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty})}{a(t_*)}\int_{B_{1/2}\cap\{s_\epsilon<t_*\leqslant t_\epsilon\}}\frac{a(s_\epsilon)}{s_\epsilon}\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2dx. \qquad (6.10)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_{1/2}\cap\{t_*\leqslant s_\epsilon<\leqslant t_\epsilon\}}\Big[\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|\Big]^2dx &= \int_{B_{1/2}\cap\{t_*\leqslant s_\epsilon<\leqslant t_\epsilon\}}\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{a(s_\epsilon)}\frac{s_\epsilon}{t_\epsilon}\frac{a(s_\epsilon)}{s_\epsilon}\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2dx\\ &\leqslant \frac{a(||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty})}{a(t_*)}\int_{B_{1/2}\cap\{t_*\leqslant s_\epsilon<\leqslant t_\epsilon\}}\frac{a(s_\epsilon)}{s_\epsilon}\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2dx. \qquad (6.11)\end{aligned}$$

Taking into account (6.8)-(6.11), we get

$$\int_{B_{1/2}}\Big[\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|\Big]^2dx \leqslant \max\Big(1,\frac{a(||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty})}{a(t_*)}\Big)\int_{B_{1/2}}\frac{a(s_\epsilon)}{s_\epsilon}\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2dx. \quad (6.12)$$

Using the fact that $\zeta = 1$ in $B_{1/2}$, we deduce from (6.7) and (6.12), by summing up from $i = 1$ to $i = N$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_{1/2}}\Big[\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|D^2u_\epsilon|\Big]^2dx &\leqslant \frac{64N(2+a_1)^2}{a_0^4}\max\Big(1,\frac{a(||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty})}{a(t_*)}\Big)\int_{B_{3/4}}(a(t_\epsilon))^2dx\\ &+\frac{2N}{a_0^2}\max\Big(1,\frac{a(||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty})}{a(t_*)}\Big)\int_{B_{3/4}}|\nabla f|a(t_\epsilon)dx. \qquad (6.13)\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (6.13) and since ∇u_ϵ is uniformly bounded in $B_{3/4}$, that $\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}D^2u_\epsilon$ is bounded in $L^2(B_{1/2})$. So there exists a subsequence and a function $W \in L^2(B_{1/2})$ such that

$$\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}D^2u_\epsilon \rightharpoonup W \quad \text{in } L^2(B_{1/2}).$$

Passing to the lim inf in (6.13), we obtain by taking into account the fact that ∇u_ϵ converges uniformly, up to a subsequence, to ∇u in $\overline{B_{3/4}}$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_{1/2}}|W|^2dx &\leqslant \liminf_{\epsilon\to 0}\int_{B_{1/2}}\Big[\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|D^2u_\epsilon|\Big]^2dx\\ &\leqslant \frac{64N(2+a_1)^2}{a_0^4}\max\Big(1,\frac{a(||\nabla u||_{B_{3/4},\infty})}{a(t_*)}\Big)\int_{B_{3/4}}(a(|\nabla u|))^2dx\\ &\quad+\frac{2N}{a_0^2}\max\Big(1,\frac{a(||\nabla u||_{B_{3/4},\infty})}{a(t_*)}\Big)\int_{B_{3/4}}|\nabla f|a(|\nabla u|)dx.\end{aligned}$$

Since ∇u_ϵ converges uniformly to ∇u in $\overline{B_{3/4}}$, we deduce that $D^2u \in L^2_{loc}(B_{1/2} \cap \{\nabla u \neq 0\})$. Consequently we obtain $W = \dfrac{a(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|} D^2 u$ a.e. in $B_{1/2} \cap \{\nabla u \neq 0\}$, and therefore we get

$$\begin{aligned} E(1/2,u) &\leqslant \frac{64N(2+a_1)^2}{a_0^4}\big(\frac{8}{3}\big)^N \max\Big(1,\frac{a(M_1)}{a(t_*)}\Big) a^2(|\nabla u|_{B_{3/4},\infty}) \\ &\quad + \frac{2N}{a_0^2|B_{1/2}|}\max\Big(1,\frac{a(M_1)}{a(t_*)}\Big) a(|\nabla u|_{B_{3/4},\infty}) \int_{B_{3/4}} |\nabla f| dx \\ &\leqslant C_2 a^2(|\nabla u|_{B_{3/4},\infty}) + C_3 a(|\nabla u|_{B_{3/4},\infty}) \int_{B_{3/4}} |\nabla f| dx. \end{aligned}$$

2^{nd} *Case* : $t \rightarrow \dfrac{a(t)}{t}$ is non-decreasing in $(0,t_*)$

Let $G(t) = t$. Using (1.5), we obtain

$$I_1^i \geqslant a_0 \int_{B_1} \zeta^2 \frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon} |\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2 dx. \tag{6.14}$$

For I_2^i, we have by Young's inequality, since $|\nabla\zeta| \leqslant 4$

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2^i| &\leqslant \int_{B_1} 8(2+a_1)\zeta \frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon} |u_{\epsilon x_i}||\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}| dx \\ &\leqslant \frac{1}{2}\int_{B_1} \zeta^2 \frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2 dx + 32(2+a_1)^2 \int_{B_{3/4}} \frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon} |u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2 dx \\ &\leqslant \frac{1}{2}\int_{B_1} \zeta^2 \frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2 dx + 32(2+a_1)^2 \int_{B_{3/4}} t_\epsilon a(t_\epsilon) dx. \end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

Integrating by parts and using the monotonicity of H_ϵ, we obtain as in the previous case

$$\begin{aligned} I^i &= \int_{B_1} f H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)(u_{\epsilon x_i}\zeta^2)_{x_i} dx \\ &= -\int_{B_1} f H_\epsilon'(u_\epsilon)(u_{u_\epsilon x_i})^2 \zeta^2 dx - \int_{B_1} f_{x_i} H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) u_{\epsilon x_i} \zeta^2 dx \\ &\leqslant -\int_{B_1} f_{x_i} H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) u_{\epsilon x_i}\zeta^2 dx. \end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

Hence we get from (6.2) and (6.14)-(6.15) that

$$\int_{B_{1/2}} \frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon} |D^2 u_\epsilon|^2 dx \leqslant 64N(2+a_1)^2 \int_{B_{3/4}} t_\epsilon a(t_\epsilon) dx + 2\int_{B_{3/4}} |\nabla f||\nabla u_\epsilon| dx. \tag{6.17}$$

Using the monotonicity of $\dfrac{a(t)}{t}$ in $(0,t_*)$, we get

$$\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon} \leqslant \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \frac{a(||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty})}{||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty}} & \text{if} \quad ||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty} < t_* \\ \frac{a(t_*)}{t_*} & \text{if} \quad ||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty} \geqslant t_* \end{array} \right\} \leqslant \frac{a(||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty})}{||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty}} \max\Big(1, \frac{||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty}}{t_*}\Big).$$

We deduce from (6.17) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_{1/2}} \Big[\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|D^2u_\epsilon|\Big]^2 dx &= \int_{B_{1/2}} \frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}.\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|D^2u_\epsilon|^2 dx \\
&\leqslant \frac{a(||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty})}{||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty}} \max\Big(1, \frac{||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty}}{t_*}\Big) \int_{B_{1/2}} \frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|D^2u_\epsilon|^2 dx \\
&\leqslant 64N(2+a_1)^2 \frac{a(||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty})}{||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty}} \max\Big(1, \frac{||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty}}{t_*}\Big) \int_{B_{3/4}} t_\epsilon a(t_\epsilon) dx \\
&\quad + 2\frac{a(||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty})}{||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty}} \max\Big(1, \frac{||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty}}{t_*}\Big) \int_{B_{3/4}} |\nabla f||\nabla u_\epsilon| dx \\
&\leqslant 64N(2+a_1)^2|B_{3/4}| \max\Big(1, \frac{||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty}}{t_*}\Big) a^2(||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty}) \\
&\quad + 2\max\Big(1, \frac{||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty}}{t_*}\Big) a(||t_\epsilon||_{B_{3/4},\infty}) \int_{B_{3/4}} |\nabla f| dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit, as in the first case, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
E(1/2,u) \quad &\leqslant \quad \max\Big(1, \frac{||\nabla u||_{B_{3/4},\infty}}{t_*}\Big)\Big(\frac{64N(2+a_1)^2|B_{3/4}|}{|B_{1/2}|} a^2(||\nabla u||_{B_{3/4},\infty}) \\
&\qquad + \frac{2}{|B_{1/2}|} a(||\nabla u||_{B_{3/4},\infty}) \int_{B_{3/4}} |\nabla f| dx\Big) \\
&\leqslant \quad C_2 a^2(||\nabla u||_{B_{3/4},\infty}) + C_3 a(||\nabla u||_{B_{3/4},\infty}) \int_{B_{3/4}} |\nabla f| dx.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Now we prove that $E(r,u)$ is uniformly bounded under the assumption (1.24)-(1.25). We observe that (1.24 means that

$$\exists K_0 > 0 : \quad \forall r \in (0,3/4) \quad \int_{B_r} |\nabla f| dx \leqslant K_0 r^{N-1}. \tag{6.18}$$

In particular, (6.18) is satisfied if $f \in C^{0,1}(\overline{B}_{3/4})$.

Lemma 6.2. *There exists a positive constant* $C_4 = C_4(a_0, a_1, a(1), N, M_0, M_1, \Lambda_0, K_0)$ *such that we have*

$$E(r, u) \leqslant C_4 \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{F}_A \quad \forall r \in (0, \frac{1}{2}).$$

Proof. Note that it is enough to prove the lemma for $r \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$. Indeed for $r \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$, we have by Lemma 6.1

$$\begin{aligned} E(r,u) &= \frac{1}{|B_r|}\int_{B_r\cap\{\nabla u\neq 0\}} \Big[\frac{a(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|}|D^2u|\Big]^2 dx \\ &\leqslant \frac{1}{|B_{1/4}|}\int_{B_{1/2}\cap\{\nabla u\neq 0\}} \Big[\frac{a(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|}|D^2u|\Big]^2 dx \\ &= \frac{|B_{1/2}|}{|B_{1/4}|}E(1/2,u) \\ &\leqslant 2^N\big(C_1a^2(||\nabla u||_{B_{3/4},\infty}) + C_2a(||\nabla u||_{B_{3/4},\infty})\int_{B_{3/4}}|\nabla f|dx\big) \\ &\leqslant C_4 = C_4(a_0,a_1,a(1),N,M_0,K_0). \end{aligned}$$

For $r \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$, we consider the function $v_r(x) = \dfrac{u(2rx)}{2r}$ defined in B_1. We have by definition of v_r, Propositions 5.1, 5.2 and (2.5)-(2.6), we have

$$0 \leqslant v_r \leqslant C_0\frac{\widetilde{A}(2r)}{2r} \leqslant C_0 2^{1+\frac{1}{a_0}}a^{-1}(r) \quad \text{in } B_1, \tag{6.19}$$

$$|\nabla v_r(x)| = |\nabla u(2rx)| \leqslant C_1a^{-1}(2r) \leqslant C_1 2^{\frac{1}{a_0}}a^{-1}(r) \quad \text{in } B_1, \tag{6.20}$$

$$D^2v_r(x) = 2r(D^2u)(2rx). \tag{6.21}$$

Using (6.21)-(6.22), we compute

$$\begin{aligned} E(\frac{1}{2},v_r) &= \frac{1}{|B_1|}\int_{B_1\cap\{\nabla v_r(\frac{1}{2}x)\neq 0\}} \Big[\frac{a(|\nabla v_r(\frac{1}{2}x)|)}{|\nabla v_r(\frac{1}{2}x)|}\big|D^2v_r(\frac{1}{2}x)\big|\Big]^2 dx \\ &= \frac{1}{|B_1|}\int_{B_1\cap\{\nabla u(rx)\neq 0\}} \Big[\frac{a(|\nabla u(rx)|)}{|\nabla u(rx)|}2r|D^2u(rx)|\Big]^2 dx \\ &= 4r^2E(r,u). \end{aligned} \tag{6.22}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\Delta_A v_r(x) = 2r(\Delta_A u)(2rx) = 2rf(2rx)\chi_{\{u(2rx)>0\}} = f_r(x)\chi_{\{v_r(x)>0\}}.$$

Using (5.2) and (6.18), we obtain from Lemma 6.1

$$\begin{aligned}
E(\frac{1}{2}, v_r) &\leqslant C_2 a^2(||\nabla v_r||_{B_{3/4},\infty}) + C_3 a(||\nabla v_r||_{B_{3/4},\infty}) \int_{B_{3/4}} |\nabla f_r| dx \\
&\leqslant C_2(a(C_1 2^{\frac{1}{a_0}} a^{-1}(r)))^2 + 4r^2 C_3 a(C_1 2^{\frac{1}{a_0}} a^{-1}(r)) \int_{B_{3/4}} |\nabla f(2rx)| dx \\
&\leqslant C_2(\max(2C_1^{a_0}, 2C_1^{a_1}))^2 a^2(a^{-1}(r)) \\
&\quad +2^{2-N} r^2 C_3 \max(2C_1^{a_0}, 2C_1^{a_1}) r r^{-N} \int_{B_{3r/2}} |\nabla f(y)| dy \\
&\leqslant 4C_2(\max(C_1^{a_0}, C_1^{a_1}))^2 r^2 + 2^{3-N} C_3 \max(C_1^{a_0}, C_1^{a_1}) K_0 r^2 \\
&= 4r^2 \max(C_1^{a_0}, C_1^{a_1})(\max(C_1^{a_0}, C_1^{a_1}) C_2 + 2^{1-N} C_3 K_0) = 4C_4 r^2. \quad (6.23)
\end{aligned}$$

Taking into account (6.22) and (6.23), we get

$$E(r,u) \leqslant C_4 = C_4(N, a_0, a_1, a(1), M_0, \Lambda_0, K_0).$$

□

Lemma 6.3. *We have*

$$\lambda_0^2 \frac{(H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon))^2}{(2+a_1)^2} \leqslant \Big[\frac{a((\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}} |D^2 u_\epsilon|\Big]^2 \quad a.e. \ in \ \ B_1. \tag{6.24}$$

Proof. Since $u_\epsilon \in W^{2,2}_{loc}(B_1)$, we obtain from (P_ϵ) by using (1.5)

$$\begin{aligned}
(\lambda_0 H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon))^2 &= \Big(div\Big(\frac{a((\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}} \nabla u_\epsilon\Big)\Big)^2 \\
&= \Big(\frac{a((\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}}\Big)^2 \Big[\Delta u_\epsilon + \Big(\frac{a'(t_\epsilon)}{a(t_\epsilon)} t_\epsilon - 1\Big) \frac{D^2 u_\epsilon . \nabla u_\epsilon}{\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2} \nabla u_\epsilon\Big]^2 \\
&\leqslant \Big(\frac{a((\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}}\Big)^2 [|\Delta u_\epsilon| + (1+a_1)|D^2 u_\epsilon|]^2 \\
&\leqslant (2+a_1)^2 \Big[\frac{a((\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}} |D^2 u_\epsilon|\Big]^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence (6.24) holds. □

Lemma 6.4. *There exists a positive constant $C_5 = C_5(a_0, a_1, a(1), N, M_0, \lambda_0, \Lambda_0, K_0)$ such that for any $0 < \delta < a(t_*/2)$ and $r < 1/4$ with $B_{2r}(x_0) \subset B_1$ and $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\} \cap B_{1/2}$, we have*

$$\mathcal{L}^N(O_\delta \cap B_r(x_0) \cap \{u > 0\}) \leqslant C_5 \delta r^{N-1}, \tag{6.25}$$

where $O_\delta = \{|\nabla u| < a^{-1}(\delta)\} \cap B_{1/2}$.

Proof. Let $r < 1/4$, $\delta > 0$ and $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\} \cap B_{1/2}$ such that $B_{2r}(x_0) \subset B_1$. We choose a function $\zeta \in \mathcal{D}(B_1)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} 0 \leqslant \zeta \leqslant 1 \quad \text{in } B_{2r}(x_0) \\ \zeta = 1 \quad \text{in } B_r(x_0) \\ |\nabla\zeta| \leq \dfrac{2}{r} \quad \text{in } B_{2r}(x_0). \end{cases}$$

We denote by u_ϵ the unique solution of the problem (P_ϵ). Let G be a function such that $G(u_{\epsilon x_i}) \in W^{1,2}(B_{2r}(x_0))$. Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 5.1, we get for $\varphi = G(u_{\epsilon x_i})\zeta$

$$\int_{B_1} \nabla_{A_\epsilon} u_\epsilon . \nabla\varphi_{x_i} dx = -\int_{B_1} f H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)\varphi_{x_i} dx.$$

Integrating by parts, we get by taking into account the monotonicity of H_ϵ

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} (\nabla_{A_\epsilon} u_\epsilon)_{x_i} . \nabla(G(u_{\epsilon x_i})\zeta) dx &= \int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} f H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)\big(G(u_{\epsilon x_i})\zeta\big)_{x_i} dx \\ &= -\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} f H'_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) u_{\epsilon x_i} G(u_{\epsilon x_i})\zeta dx \\ &\quad -\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} f_{x_i} H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) G(u_{\epsilon x_i})\zeta dx \\ &\leqslant -\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} f_{x_i} H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) G(u_{\epsilon x_i})\zeta dx. \end{aligned} \tag{6.26}$$

Note that

$$(\nabla_{A_\epsilon} u_\epsilon)_{x_i} = \frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}\Big[\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i} + \Big(\frac{a'(t_\epsilon)}{a(t_\epsilon)} t_\epsilon - 1\Big)\frac{\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i} . \nabla u_\epsilon}{\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2}\nabla u_\epsilon\Big].$$

Then (6.26) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} \zeta G'(u_{\epsilon x_i})\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}\Big[|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2 + \Big(\frac{a'(t_\epsilon)}{a(t_\epsilon)} t_\epsilon - 1\Big)\frac{|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i} . \nabla u_\epsilon|^2}{\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2}\Big] dx \\ &\quad \leqslant -\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} G(u_{\epsilon x_i})\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}\Big[\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i} + \Big(\frac{a'(t_\epsilon)}{a(t_\epsilon)} t_\epsilon - 1\Big)\frac{\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i} . \nabla u_\epsilon}{\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2}\nabla u_\epsilon\Big] . \nabla\zeta dx \\ &\qquad -\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} f_{x_i} H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) G(u_{\epsilon x_i})\zeta dx \\ &\quad \leqslant \frac{2}{r} a_1 \int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} |G(u_{\epsilon x_i})|\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}| dx - \int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} f_{x_i} H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) G(u_{\epsilon x_i})\zeta dx. \end{aligned} \tag{6.27}$$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} |G(u_{\epsilon x_i})| \frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon} |\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}| dx &\leqslant \int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} |G(u_{\epsilon x_i}) - G(u_{x_i})| \frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon} |\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}| dx \\
&+ \int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} |G(u_{x_i})| \frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon} |\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}| dx \\
&= J_1^i + J_2^i. \qquad (6.28)
\end{aligned}$$

According to the assumption (1.25), we shall discuss two cases:

$\underline{1^{st}\ Case}$: $\dfrac{a(t)}{t}$ is non-increasing in $(0, t_*)$

For each $\epsilon > 0$ and $\eta = a(2a^{-1}(\delta))$, we consider the function

$$G(t) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{a((\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2}} a^{-1}(\eta) & \text{if } \ t > a^{-1}(\eta) \\ \dfrac{a((\epsilon + t^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + t^2)^{1/2}} t & \text{if } \ |t| \leqslant a^{-1}(\eta) \\ -\dfrac{a((\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2}} a^{-1}(\eta) & \text{if } \ t < -a^{-1}(\eta). \end{cases}$$

G is Lipschitz continuous and we have

$$G'(t) \quad = \quad \frac{a((\epsilon + t^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + t^2)^{1/2}} \Big[1 + \Big(\frac{a'((\epsilon + t^2)^{1/2})}{a((\epsilon + t^2)^{1/2})} (\epsilon + t^2)^{1/2} - 1 \Big) \frac{t^2}{\epsilon + t^2} \Big] \chi_{\{|t| < a^{-1}(\eta)\}}$$

$$a_0 \frac{a((\epsilon + t^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + t^2)^{1/2}} \chi_{\{|t| < a^{-1}(\eta)\}} \leqslant G'(t) \leqslant a_1 \frac{a((\epsilon + t^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + t^2)^{1/2}} \chi_{\{|t| < a^{-1}(\eta)\}}.$$

Let $t_\epsilon = (\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}$. Since $\zeta = 1$ in $B_{r/2}$, and $\{|\nabla u_\epsilon| < a^{-1}(\eta)\} \subset \{|u_{\epsilon x_i}| < a^{-1}(\eta)\}$, we obtain from (6.27)-(6.28) and the monotonicity of $\frac{a(t)}{t}$, since $a^{-1}(\eta) = 2a^{-1}(2\delta) < t_*$

$$\begin{aligned}
a_0^2 \int_{B_r \cap \{|\nabla u_\epsilon| < a^{-1}(\eta)\}} \Big(\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon} \Big)^2 |\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2 dx &\leqslant a_0^2 \int_{B_r \cap \{|u_{\epsilon x_i}| < a^{-1}(\eta)\}} \Big(\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon} \Big)^2 |\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2 dx \\
&\leqslant a_0^2 \int_{B_r \cap \{|u_{\epsilon x_i}| < a^{-1}(\eta)\}} \frac{a((\epsilon + |u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + |u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2)^{1/2}} \frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon} |\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2 dx \\
&\leqslant \frac{2}{r} a_1 (J_1^i + J_2^i) + \int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} |\nabla f| |G(u_{\epsilon x_i})| dx. \qquad (6.29)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $|G(t)| \leqslant a((\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2}$, we obtain by taking into account (6.18)

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} |\nabla f| |G(u_{\epsilon x_i})| dx \quad &\leqslant \quad a((\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2} \int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} |\nabla f| dx \\
&\leqslant \quad K_0 a((\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2} (2r)^{N-1}. \qquad (6.30)
\end{aligned}$$

We claim that $|G(u_{\epsilon x_i}) - G(u_{x_i})| \longrightarrow 0$ in $L^2(B_{2r}(x_0))$, as $\epsilon \to 0$.

Indeed, first we have $|G(u_{\epsilon x_i}) - G(u_{x_i})| \leqslant \eta \; \forall x \in B_{2r}(x_0)$.
Let $x \in B_{2r}(x_0)$. We discuss two cases :
$*$ If $u_{x_i}(x) = 0$, then there exists by the uniform convergence of ∇u_ϵ to ∇u in $\overline{B}_{1/2}$, $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\forall \epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$, $|u_{\epsilon x_i}(x)| < a^{-1}(\eta)$. So $G(u_{\epsilon x_i}) = \dfrac{a((\epsilon + |u_{x_i}|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + |u_{x_i}|^2)^{1/2}} u_{\epsilon x_i}$, $G(u_{x_i}(x)) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |G(u_{\epsilon x_i}) - G(u_{\epsilon x_i})| &= \Big| \frac{a((\epsilon + |u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + |u_{\epsilon x_i}(x)|^2)^{1/2}} u_{\epsilon x_i}(x) - 0 \Big| \\ &\leqslant a((\epsilon + |u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2)^{1/2}) \longrightarrow a(|u_{x_i}|) = 0 \\ &\quad \epsilon \to 0. \end{aligned}$$

$*$ If $u_{x_i}(x) \neq 0$, then $|u_{x_i}(x)| > 0$ and there exists an $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\forall \epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$, $|u_{x_i}(x)|/2 < |u_{\epsilon x_i}(x)| < 3|u_{x_i}(x)|/2$. So

$$\begin{aligned} |G(u_{\epsilon x_i}) - G(u_{x_i})| &= |G'(\theta_\epsilon)|.|u_{\epsilon x_i}(x) - u_{x_i}(x)| \qquad \text{with } \theta_\epsilon \longrightarrow u_{x_i}(x) \\ &\leqslant a_1 \frac{a(\theta_\epsilon)}{\theta_\epsilon} |u_{\epsilon x_i}(x) - u_{x_i}(x)| \\ &\longrightarrow a_1 \frac{a(|u_{x_i}(x)|)}{|u_{x_i}(x)|} |u_{x_i}(x) - u_{x_i}(x)| = 0. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we know (see proof of Lemma 6.1) that

$$\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} \Big[\frac{a((\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}} |\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}| \Big]^2 dx \leqslant C.$$

It follows that up to a subsequence

$$\frac{a((\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}} \nabla u_{\epsilon x_i} \rightharpoonup W_i \qquad \text{in } L^2(B_{2r}(x_0)).$$

Therefore

$$J_1^i = \int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} |G(u_{\epsilon x_i}) - G(u_{x_i})| \frac{a((\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}} |\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}| dx \longrightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \to 0. \quad (6.31)$$

For J_2^i, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
J_2^i &= \int_{B_{2r}\cap\{\nabla u\neq 0\}} |G(u_{x_i})|.\frac{a((\epsilon+|\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon+|\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}| \qquad \text{since } G(0)=0\\
&\leqslant a((\epsilon+(a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2})\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)\cap\{\nabla u\neq 0\}} \frac{a((\epsilon+|\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon+|\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|\\
&\leqslant a((\epsilon+(a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2})|B_{2r}(x_0)|^{1/2}.\Big(\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)\cap\{\nabla u\neq 0\}}\Big[\frac{a((\epsilon+|\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}))}{(\epsilon+|\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}}|D^2u_\epsilon|\Big]^2\Big)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{6.32}
$$

We claim that $O_\delta \subset \{|\nabla u_\epsilon| < a^{-1}(\eta)\}$. Indeed since ∇u_ϵ converges uniformly to ∇u in $\overline{B}_{1/2}$, there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$
\forall \epsilon\in(0,\epsilon_0),\quad |\nabla u_\epsilon - \nabla u|_{\infty,\overline{B}_{1/2}} < a^{-1}(\delta)/2.
$$

We deduce that for $x\in \cap O_\delta$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\forall\epsilon\in(0,\epsilon_0),\quad |\nabla u_\epsilon(x)| &\leqslant |\nabla u_\epsilon(x)-\nabla u(x)| + |\nabla u(x)|\\
&< a^{-1}(\delta)/2 + a^{-1}(\delta)\\
&< 2a^{-1}(\delta) = a^{-1}(\eta).
\end{aligned}
$$

We obtain from (6.29)

$$
\begin{aligned}
a_0^2\int_{B_r(x_0)\cap O_\delta}\Big(\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}\Big)^2|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2dx &\leqslant \frac{2}{r}a_1(J_1^i+J_2^i)\\
&\quad + K_0 2^{N-1}a((\epsilon+(a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2}r^{N-1}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{6.33}
$$

Summing up from $i=1$ to N in (6.33) and using (6.1) and (6.32), we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{a_0^2}{(2+a_1)^2}\int_{B_r(x_0)\cap O_\delta}(\lambda_0 H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)^2dx \leqslant \frac{2a_1}{r}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{i=N}J_1^i\\
&+Na((\epsilon+(a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2})|B_{2r}(x_0)|^{1/2}.\Big(\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)\cap\{\nabla u\neq 0\}}\Big[\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|D^2u_\epsilon|\Big]^2dx\Big)^{1/2}\Big)\\
&+NK_0 2^{N-1}a((\epsilon+(a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2})r^{N-1}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{6.34}
$$

Letting $\epsilon \to 0$ in (6.34), and using (6.31) and Lemma 6.2, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\lambda_0^2 a_0^2}{(2+a_1)^2}\int_{B_r(x_0)\cap O_\delta \cap \{u>0\}} dx\\
&\quad \leqslant \frac{2a_1}{r} N\eta |B_{2r}(x_0)|^{1/2}.\Big(\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)\cap\{\nabla u\neq 0\}} \Big[\frac{a(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|}|D^2 u|\Big]^2 dx\Big)^{1/2}\\
&\quad + NK_0 2^{N-1}\eta r^{N-1}\\
&\quad \leqslant N\eta\frac{2}{r}|B_{2r}(x_0)|^{1/2}.(C(a_0,a_1,a(1),N,M_0,\Lambda_0,K_0)|B_{2r}(x_0)|)^{1/2}\\
&\quad\ + NK_0 2^{N-1}\eta r^{N-1},
\end{aligned}
$$

which can be written

$$
\mathcal{L}^N(O_\delta \cap B_r(x_0)\cap\{u>0\}) \leqslant C(a_0,a_1,a(1),N,M_0,\lambda_0,\Lambda_0,K_0)\delta r^{N-1}.
$$

$\underline{2^{nd}\ Case}$: $\dfrac{a(t)}{t}$ is nondecreasing in $(0,t_*)$

For each $\epsilon > 0$ and $\eta = a(2a^{-1}(\delta))$, we consider the function

$$
G(t) = \begin{cases}
\dfrac{a((\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2}} a^{-1}(\eta) & \text{if} \quad t > a^{-1}(\eta)\\
\dfrac{a((\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2}} t & \text{if} \quad |t| \leqslant a^{-1}(\eta)\\
-\dfrac{a((\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2}} a^{-1}(\eta) & \text{if} \quad t < -a^{-1}(\eta).
\end{cases}
$$

G is Lipschitz continuous and we have

$$
0 \leqslant G'(t) = \frac{a((\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2}} \chi_{\{|t|<a^{-1}(\eta)\}}.
$$

Using (1.5) and the fact that $\zeta = 1$ in B_r, and since $|G(t)| \leqslant a((\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2}$, we obtain from (6.27)-(6.28) by taking into account (6.18), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B_r \cap \{|u_{\epsilon x_i}|<a^{-1}(\eta)\}} \frac{a((\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2}} \frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2 dx\\
&\quad \leqslant \frac{2}{r} a_1 \int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} |G(u_{\epsilon x_i})| \frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}| dx + K_0 a((\epsilon + (a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2}(2r)^{N-1}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\{|\nabla u_\epsilon| < a^{-1}(\eta)\} \subset \{|u_{\epsilon x_i}| < a^{-1}(\eta)\}$, we obtain by using the monotonicity of $\dfrac{a(t)}{t}$ in $(0,t_*)$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_r\cap\{|\nabla u_\epsilon|<a^{-1}(\eta)\}} &\Big(\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}\Big)^2|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2dx\\ &\leqslant \int_{B_r\cap\{|u_{\epsilon x_i}|<a^{-1}(\eta)\}}\frac{a((\epsilon+(a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon+(a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2}}\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2dx\\ &\leqslant \frac{2}{r}a_1(J_1^i+J_2^i)+K_0 2^{N-1}a((\epsilon+(a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2}r^{N-1}. \qquad (6.35)\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$|G(u_{\epsilon x_i})-G(u_{x_i})|\leqslant\frac{a((\epsilon+(a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon+(a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2}}|u_{\epsilon x_i}-u_{x_i}|,\quad \forall x\in B_{2r}(x_0)$$

we deduce that $|G(u_{\epsilon x_i})-G(u_{x_i})|\longrightarrow 0$ in $L^2(B_{2r}(x_0))$, as $\epsilon\to 0$.
As in the first case, we have up to a subsequence

$$\frac{a((\epsilon+|\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon+|\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}}\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}\rightharpoonup W_i \qquad \text{in } L^2(B_{2r}(x_0)).$$

Therefore

$$J_1^i=\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)}|G(u_{\epsilon x_i})-G(u_{x_i})||\big(\frac{a((\epsilon+|\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon+|\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|dx\longrightarrow 0,\ \ \text{as }\ \epsilon\to 0. \qquad (6.36)$$

For J_2^i, we have

$$\begin{aligned}J_2^i&=\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)\cap\{\nabla u\neq 0\}}|G(u_{x_i})|.\frac{a((\epsilon+|\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon+|\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}| \qquad \text{since } G(0)=0\\ &\leqslant a((\epsilon+(a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2})\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)\cap\{\nabla u\neq 0\}}\frac{a((\epsilon+|\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon+|\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}}|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|\\ &\leqslant a((\epsilon+(a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2})|B_{2r}(x_0)|^{1/2}.\Big(\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)\cap\{\nabla u\neq 0\}}\Big[\frac{a((\epsilon+|\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2})}{(\epsilon+|\nabla u_\epsilon|^2)^{1/2}}|D^2u|\Big]^2\Big)^{1/2}.\end{aligned}\qquad (6.37)$$

As in the first case, we have $O_\delta\subset\overline{B}_{1/2}\cap\{|\nabla u_\epsilon|<a^{-1}(\eta)\}$. Since we have also $\{|\nabla u_\epsilon|<a^{-1}(\eta)\}\subset\{|u_{\epsilon x_i}|<a^{-1}(\eta)\}$, we obtain from (6.35)

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_r(x_0)\cap O_\delta\cap\{u>0\}}\Big(\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}\Big)^2|\nabla u_{\epsilon x_i}|^2dx&\leqslant\frac{2}{r}a_1(J_1^i+J_2^i)\\ &+K_0 2^{N-1}a((\epsilon+(a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2}r^{N-1}. \qquad (6.38)\end{aligned}$$

Using (6.1), (6.37), we get from (6.38)

$$\frac{1}{(2+a_1)^2}\int_{B_r(x_0)\cap O_\delta}(\lambda_0 H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)^2dx \leqslant \frac{2a_1}{r}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{i=N} J_1^i$$
$$+Na((\epsilon+(a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2})\frac{2}{r}|B_{2r}(x_0)|^{1/2}.\Big(\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)\cap\{\nabla u\neq 0\}}\Big[\frac{a(t_\epsilon)}{t_\epsilon}|D^2u_\epsilon|\Big]^2dx\Big)^{1/2}\Big)$$
$$+NK_0 2^{N-1}a((\epsilon+(a^{-1}(\eta))^2)^{1/2}r^{N-1}. \tag{6.39}$$

Letting $\epsilon \to 0$ in (6.39), and using (6.36) together with Lemma 6.2, we obtain

$$\frac{\lambda_0^2}{(2+a_1)^2}\int_{B_r(x_0)\cap O_\delta\cap\{u>0\}}dx$$
$$\leqslant \frac{2a_1}{r}N\eta|B_{2r}(x_0)|^{1/2}.\Big(\int_{B_{2r}(x_0)\cap\{\nabla u\neq 0\}}\Big[\frac{a(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|}|D^2u|\Big]^2dx\Big)^{1/2}+NK_0 2^{N-1}\eta r^{N-1}$$
$$\leqslant N\eta\frac{2}{r}|B_{2r}(x_0)|^{1/2}.(C_4(a_0,a_1,a(1),N,M_0,\Lambda_0,K_0)|B_{2r}(x_0)|)^{1/2}+NK_0 2^{N-1}\eta r^{N-1},$$

which can be written

$$\mathcal{L}^N(O_\delta\cap B_r(x_0)\cap\{u>0\})\leqslant C_5 = C_5(a_0,a_1,a(1),\lambda_0,N,M_0,\Lambda_0,K_0)\delta r^{N-1}.$$

□

Now we give the proof of Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Let $r\in(0,1/4)$, $B_r(x_0)\subset B_1$ with $x_0\in\partial\{u>0\}\cap B_{1/2}$ and $\delta>0$. First we recall the definition of Hausdorff measure. Let E be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$ and $s\in[0,\infty)$. The $s-$dimensional Hausdorff measure of E is defined by

$$H^s(E)=\lim_{\delta\to 0}H^s_\delta(E)=\sup_{\delta>0}H^s_\delta(E),$$

where for $\delta>0$,

$$H^s_\delta(E)=\inf\Big\{\ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\alpha(s)\Big(\frac{diam(C_j)}{2}\Big)^s\ |\ E\subset\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty}C_j,\ diam(C_j)\leqslant\delta\ \Big\}$$

$\alpha(s)=\dfrac{\pi^{s/2}}{\Gamma(s/2+1)}$, $\Gamma(s)=\displaystyle\int_0^\infty e^{-t}t^{s-1}dt$, for $s>0$ is the usual Gamma function.

Let $E=\partial\{u>0\}\cap B_r(x_0)$ and denote by $(B_\delta(x_i))_{i\in I}$ a finite covering of E, with $x_i\in\partial\{u>0\}$ and $P(N)$ maximum overlapping.
From the proof of Theorem 3.1 of [8], we know that there exists a constant $c_0 = c(a_0,a_1,N,M_0,\lambda_0,\Lambda_0)$ such that

$$\forall i\in I\ \ \exists y_i\in B_\delta(x_i)\ :\ \ B_{c_0\delta}(y_i)\subset B_\delta(x_i)\cap\{u>0\}\cap O_\delta. \tag{6.40}$$

We deduce from (6.17) and Lemma 6.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i\in I}\mathcal{L}^N(B_1)c_0^N\delta^N &= \sum_{i\in I}\mathcal{L}^N(B_{c_0\delta}(y_i)) \leqslant \sum_{i\in I}\mathcal{L}^N(B_\delta(x_i)\cap\{u>0\}\cap O_\delta)\\ &\leqslant P(N)\mathcal{L}^N(B_r(x_0)\cap\{u>0\}\cap O_\delta) \leqslant P(N)C\delta r^{N-1}\end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(N, a_0, a_1, a(1), M, \lambda_0, \Lambda_0, K_0)$. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i\in I}\alpha(N-1)\Big(\frac{diam B_\delta(x_i)}{2}\Big)^{N-1} &\leqslant \frac{\alpha(N-1)}{\mathcal{L}^n(B_1)c_0(N,a_0,a_1,M_0,\lambda_0,\Lambda_0)}P(N)Cr^{N-1}\\ &= \overline{C} = \overline{C}(N,a_0,a_1,a(1),M_0,\lambda_0,\Lambda_0,K_0)r^{N-1}.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $H_\delta^{N-1}(\partial\{u>0\}\cap B_r(x_0)) \leqslant \overline{C}r^{N-1}$. Letting $\delta \to 0$, we get

$$H^{N-1}(\partial\{u>0\}\cap B_r(x_0)) \leqslant \overline{C}r^{N-1}.$$

□

Finally we give the proof of the stability result in Corollary 1.1.. We will use the same notation $I(u)$ to denote the local coincidence set $\{u = 0\}\cap B_{1/2}$ for each $u \in \mathcal{F}_A$. We also set $E_{-\epsilon} = \{x \in E \ : \ d(x, E^c) > \epsilon \}$, where E^c is the complement of the set E. Then we have

Proof of Corollary 1.1. We set $E_{-\epsilon} = \{x \in E \ : \ d(x, E^c) > \epsilon \}$, where E^c is the complement of the set E.

$i)$ First note that if $x \in I(u_1)$, then $u_1(x) = 0$ and then

$$u_2(x) = |u_1(x) - u_2(x)| \leqslant |u_1 - u_2|_\infty < \widetilde{A}(\epsilon).$$

We deduce that $I(u_1) \subset \{u_2 < \widetilde{A}(\epsilon)\}\cap B_{1/2}$ and in particular

$$I(u_1)\setminus I(u_2) \subset \{0 < u_2 < \widetilde{A}(\epsilon)\}\cap B_{1/2}.$$

Since moreover $\{0 < u_2 < \widetilde{A}(\epsilon)\}\cap B_{1/2} \subset O_\epsilon \cap B_{1/2}$, it follows then by Lemma 6.1 that we have

$$\mathcal{L}^N(I(u_1)\setminus I(u_2)) \leqslant \mathcal{L}^N(O_\epsilon\cap B_{1/2}) \leqslant C(N, a_0, a_1, a(1), M_0, \lambda_0)\epsilon.$$

Similarly we prove that

$$\mathcal{L}^N(I(u_2)\setminus I(u_1)) \leqslant C(N, a_0, a_1, a(1), M_0, \lambda_0)\epsilon.$$

It follows that $\mathcal{L}^N(I(u_1) \div I(u_2)) = \mathcal{L}^N(I(u_1)\setminus I(u_2)) + \mathcal{L}^N(I(u_2)\setminus I(u_1)) \leqslant C\epsilon$.

ii) We have already proved that $I(u_1) \subset \{u_2 < \widetilde{A}(\epsilon)\} \cap B_{1/2}$. Let us show that $(I(u_2))_{-C\epsilon} \subset I(u_1)$. So let $x \in (I(u_2))_{-C\epsilon}$. Then we have $x \in I(u_2)$ and $d(x, (I(u_2))^c) > C\epsilon$. Now assume that $u_1(x) > 0$, we obtain by using Lemma 3.1 of [8], for C large enough

$$\sup_{\partial B_{C\epsilon}(x)} u_1 \geqslant \frac{N}{\lambda_0} \widetilde{A}\Big(\frac{\lambda_0}{N} C\epsilon\Big) + u_1(x) > \widetilde{A}(\epsilon).$$

We deduce that there exists $x' \in \partial B_{C\epsilon}(x)$ such that $u_1(x') > \widetilde{A}(\epsilon)$. If $u_2(x') = 0$, we obtain $u_1(x') \leqslant \widetilde{A}(\epsilon)$. Hence we have necessarily $u_2(x') > 0$. This leads to $d(x, (I(u_2))^c) \leqslant |x - x'| = C\epsilon$, which contradicts the fact that $d(x, (I(u_2))^c) > C\epsilon$. We conclude that $u_1(x) = 0$, i.e. $x \in I(u_1)$. □

Acknowledgments. The first two authors are grateful for the facilities and excellent research conditions at the Fields Institute. This work was completed while the second author was visiting the CMAF, and while the third author was visiting the Fields Institute. They would like to thank these institutions for the hospitality during their visits.

References

[1] R. A. Adams : Sobolev spaces. Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 65. Academic Press, New York-London, 1975.

[2] L. Aharouch, A. Benkirane and M. Rhoudaf : Existence results for some unilateral problems without sign condition with obstacle free in Orlicz spaces. Nonlinear Anal. Vol. 68, No. 8, 2362-2380 (2008).

[3] A. Benkirane, J. Bennouna : Existence and uniqueness of solution of unilateral problems with L^1-data in Orlicz spaces. Ital. J. Pure Appl. Math. No. 16, , 87-102, (2004).

[4] P. Bénilan, L. Boccardo, T. Gallouët, R. Gariepy, M. Pierre, J. L. Vázquez : An L^1-theory of existence and uniqueness of solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) Vol. 22, No. 2, 241-273 (1995).

[5] L. Boccardo, T. Gallouët and L. Orsina : Existence and uniqueness of entropy solutions for nonlinear elliptic equations with measure data. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire Vol. 13, No. 5, 539-551 (1996).

[6] L. Boccardo, G. R. Cirmi : Existence and uniqueness of solution of unilateral problems with L^1 data. J. Convex Anal. Vol. 6, No. 1, 195-206 (1999).

[7] L. A. Caffarelli : A Remark on the Hausdorff Measure of a Free Boundar, and the Convergence of the Coincidence Sets : Bolletino UMI 18. A (5), 109-113 (1981).

[8] S. Challal & A. Lyaghfouri : Porosity of Free Boundaries in $A-$Obstacle Problems. Nonlinear Analysis : Theory, Methods & Applications, Vol. 70, No. 7, 2772-2778 (2009).

[9] S. Challal & A. Lyaghfouri : Hölder Continuity of Solutions to the A-Laplace Equation Involving Measures. Communications in Pure and Applied Analysis. Vol. 8, No. 5, 1577-1583 (2009).

[10] S. Challal & A. Lyaghfouri : Second Order Regularity for the A-Laplace Operator. Mediterranean Journal of Mathematics. Vol. 7, No. 4 (2010).

[11] S. Challal & A. Lyaghfouri : Some properties of A-harmonic functions in the plane. In preparation.

[12] L. Karp, T. Kilpeläinen, A. Petrosyan and H. Shahgholian : On the Porosity of Free Boundaries in Degenerate Variational Inequalities. J. Differential Equations Vol. 164, 110-117 (2000).

[13] G. M. Lieberman : The natural generalization of the natural conditions of Ladyzhenskaya and Uraltseva for elliptic equations. Comm. Partial Differential Equations Vol. 16, No. 2-3, 311-361 (1991).

[14] G. M. Lieberman : Regularity of Solutions to Some degenerate Double Obstacle Problems. Indiana University Mathematics Journal, Vol. 40, No. 3, 1009-1028 (1991).

[15] K. Lee and H. Shahgholian : Hausdorff Measure and Stability for the p-Obstacle Problem, $2 < p < \infty$. J. Differential Equations Vol. 195, No. 1, 14-24 (2003).

[16] S. Martinez and N. Wolanski : *A Minimum Problem with Free Boundary in Orlicz-Sobolev spaces.* Advances in Mathematics 218, 1914-1971 (2008).

[17] J. Malý, W. P. Ziemer : Fine regularity of solutions of elliptic partial differential equations. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 51. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997.

[18] J. F. Rodrigues : Obstacle problems in mathematical physics. North-Holland Mathematics Studies, 134. Mathematical Notes, 114. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, (1987).

[19] J. F. Rodrigues : Stability remarks to the obstacle problem for p-Laplacian type equations. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations Vol. 23, No. 1, 51-65 (2005).

[20] J. F. Rodrigues, M. Sanchón, Manel and J. M. Urbano: The obstacle problem for nonlinear elliptic equations with variable growth and L^1-data. Monatsh. Math. Vol. 154, No. 4, 303-322 (2008).